DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 808 EA 022 346

AUTHOR	Rapple, Brendan A.
TITLE	Payment by Educational Results: An Idea Whose Time Has Gone? Thirty-Five Years of Experimentation with Educational Efficiency in England (1862-1897). MacArthur-Spencer Series Number 14.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Univ., Normal. Center for the Study of Educational Finance.
SPONS AGENCY	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	42p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Accountability; Achievement Tests; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditure per Student; Federal Aid; *Financial Policy; Foreign Countries; Incentives; Instruction; Merit Rating; *National Competency Tests; Resource Allocation; Social Control; Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

A historical mode of inquiry to inform public policy discussions on accountability and economic efficiency in the public schools is presented. "Payment of results," a method of accountability instituted in the English elementary education system during the last-half of the 19th century, which was based upon governmental grants dependent upon student academic performance. Major criticisms are its emphasis on social control, mechanical nature, and the relationship between education and value for money. A conclusion is that payment by results was a restrictive system of educational accountability that impeded educational progress in England for the second-half of the 19th century, and that long-term benefits were sacrificed for short-term financial reward. True accountability should not be contingent upon examination results because the pedagogical methods used to attain those results will be mechanical, nonhumanistic, and detrimental to students. (191 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324808

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Hickrod
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE

Department of Educational Administration and Foundations
College of Education and the Graduate School
Illinois State University, Normal Illinois

The MacArthur/Spencer Special Series on Illinois Finance

MacArthur/Spencer Series Number 14

PAYMENT BY EDUCATIONAL RESULTS: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS GONE?

Thirty-five Years of Experimentation with Educational Efficiency in England (1862-1897)

Brenden A. Rapple

EA022346

PREFACE

"Now, what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon Facts; nothing else will ever be of any service to them. This is the principle upon which I bring up my own children, and this is the principle upon which I bring up these children. Stick to the Facts, Sir!" Thus spake Thomas Gradgrind. So, Mr. MacChoakumchild began in his best manner. He and some one hundred and forty other schoolmasters, had been lately turned out at the same time, in the same factory, on the same principles, like so many piano legs.....Ah, rather overdone MacChoakumchild, if he had only learned a little less, how infinitely better he might have taught much more.

–Charles Dickens, Hard Times

It has been a distinct pleasure for me to have been associated with the MacArthur/Spencer special series in educational finance. These monographs span an enormous range of intellectual disciplines which include historical studies, legal studies, policy papers, as well as the usual econometric and empirical, quantitative studies in school finance. Comes now Dr. Brendan A. Rapple of the O'Neill Library, Boston College, with what I thoroughly believe will be one of the more thought-provoking studies in the series. In this, the fourteenth monograph of the series, we return to the historical mode of inquiry used in the first two monographs in the MacArthur/Spencer studies. This is, however, history done with a purpose, and that purpose is to inform the current public policy discussions over accountability and economic efficiency in the public schools. In number eleven of this series, the Center for the Study of Educational Finance began an empirical investigation of "technical economic efficiency" in the public schools of Illinois. The Center shall continue that line of inquiry and expand it later with more conceptual and theoretical approaches to the "efficiency" subject. However, the authors expressed, upon the publication of monograph number eleven, considerable doubts and misgivings about this entire approach to "economic efficiency" in public education. Surely, nothing in the particular historical study published here allays those doubts; indeed, our reservations about the entire topic of efficiency and accountability in education are now even stronger, having finished reading the Rapple work.

Dr. Rapple concludes, for example, that after thirty-five years of British experience, "reward for effect" was a deep and dismal failure. "Long-term educational benefits," he says, "were sacrificed to the short-term financial reward." And he warns that, "true accountability in education should not be facilely linked to mechanical examination results." Many will surely applaud his conclusions. But, like any good study, more questions are raised here than are answered. Does this mean that all attempts at educational accountability based upon test results, in any country, are equally doomed to failure? Or does it only mean that this particular experiment in the educational history of England and Wales somehow went desperately wrong? Is it, indeed, possible to separate this experiment from the Victorian context in which it took place? Professional historians would be extremely reluctant to draw any conclusions applicable to present-day United States from an educational system intended to serve a very highly socially-stratified society, like that of late 19th century England and Wales. But given the proliferation of accountability statutes in the United States, including the "School District Report Card" in the state of Illinois, Rapple's warnings are very well timed. Certainly, it would be tragic if the district reporting requirements in any state, including Illinois, were to end up limiting, rather than expanding, educational opportunities. Nothing, absolutely nothing, could be further from the minds of the authors of the accountability statutes than that.

George Santayana once said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." But Earl Warren, quoting G.B. Shaw, quoting Hegel, said, "The only thing we learn from history, is that we do not learn from history." However, the stakes are too great for school children in Illinois to ignore Santayana's warning. Therefore, before we go much further with accountability and economic efficiency in Illinois public schools, we had better have a thorough discussion of Rapple's work on the British experience with "reward for effect." We cannot be so stupid in the United States as to ignore three and half decades of experience, even if it was a century ago in a society much less open than our own.

Brendan Rapple happens to be a speaker and reader of the Gaelic, so I will conclude in that language. But since he reads and speaks the Irish Gaelic, rather than the Scots Gaelic, I had better include the English translation for his sake, as well as for the reader's. Bha sibh sgriobh leabhar gle mhath, meal-a-naidheachd! (You have written a very good book, congratulations!) You may have also just proven Polybius to have been right: "History offers the best training for those who are to take part in public affairs."

Dr. Rapple and I express our appreciation to Professor Chris Eisele of Illinois State University for his careful reading of the manuscript and his suggestions for improvement and structure. As in all studies in the MacArthur/Spencer series, the conclusions of fact or opinion are those of the author alone and do not necessarily constitute those of the Center for the Study of Educational Finance, Illinois State University, or any funding source. Readers are also encouraged to correspond directly with major authors in the series on any topic they consider worth further investigation. Dr. Rapple can be reached at the O'Neill Library, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167.

G.A. Karnes Wallis Hickrod
The Distinguished Professor of Educational Administration and
Foundations, Illinois State University;
Director, Center for the Study of Educational Finance
Normal, Illinois
February, 1990

PAYMENT BY EDUCATIONAL RESULTS:
AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS GONE?
Thirty-five Years of Experimentation with
Educational Efficiency in England (1862-1897)

Elementary Education Until the Newcastle Commission

"Payment by results," a pervasive method of accountability in English and Welsh elementary education, was a system whereby a school's governmental grant depended for the most part on how well pupils answered in the annual examination conducted by Her Majesty's Inspectors. In turn, reviled and lauded by commentators from its inception in 1862, the scheme endured for three and a half decades during the second half of the nineteenth century. The following pages review payment by results–treating its origin, its principles, its practice, and its effects–in an attempt to establish whether vilification or praise is its rightful due.

It is often posited that state involvement was an anathema to most British during the nineteenth century. However, such gross generalizations are frequently misleading. In this case, it is extremely easy to demonstrate both truth and inaccuracy. While very many during this long period did hold that personal liberty was well nigh sacred, as the century progressed, the role of state power steadily grew and the widely held perception of the state as a gross *bete noire* gradually declined. Nevertheless, much of the Victorian age was, indeed, marked by a high level of individualism and staunch trust in private enterprise; and, in few spheres, was this more evident than in that of education. To many Victorians, for whom Samuel Smiles' persuasive injunction of "Self Help" was to be obeyed at all costs, it was essential to preserve education free from the encroaching tentacles of governmental interference. The principles of *laissez faire* were to be earnestly embraced in all areas. Indeed, it was as late as 1870 that a comprehensive state system of elementary education was established; even then, it remained a dual system with the various denominations taking their part in providing schools. Moreover, it was the twentieth century, 1902, before a state secondary system was introduced.

Of course, the Government had been involved in the realm of educational provision long before those two dates. From the early years of the nineteenth century, a number of bills were introduced, many still-born, which sought to extend the power of the state over elementary education. One which did pass was Sir Robert Peel's 1802 "Health and Morals of Apprentices Act" which obliged factory owners to provide free teaching for their young apprentices for a part of every working day. The working of this Act was, for the most part, ineffectual, but "it at least represented the beginning of government interest and State action in the educational sphere."[1] Five years later, Samuel Whitbread unsuccessfully introduced his "Parochial Schools Bill" which sought to establish a countrywide system of parish schools, aided by the rates which would provide two years of free schooling to poor children. In 1820, greatly influenced by findings of the 1816-1818 Parliamentary Select Committees which reported very serious inadequacies and problems in the existing meager elementary education, Henry Brougham put forward a "Parish Schools Bill," the main terms of which revolved about the establishment of a national system, but one whereby the staff and curricula were under the control of the Church of England. However, though religious instruction was to be nondenominational, it was inevitable that the Bill would fail due to the opposition of the Dissenters and Catholics.

A dramatic step was taken in 1833, when the first state money was granted to elementary education; hitherto, all schools and teachers' salaries had been provided by voluntary, generally religious, organizations. However, it would be wrong to imagine that governmental benefice heralded an immediate and dramatic death knell to voluntary activity, for the 1833 grant, intended to assist in the erection of school buildings, amounted to only £20,000. This paultry sum, as has frequently been pointed out by commentators, was far lower than that

expended on the upkeep of Her Majesty's stables. The money was given to two religious societies for disposal, the *National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales*, founded in 1811, and the Nonconformist *Royal Lancastrian Institution*, later known as the *British and Foreign School Society*, founded in 1808. Moreover, there was an important stipulation that local subscriptions for the erection of a school should amount to at least 50% of the grant money. As the Church of England's *National Society* had more resources and, accordingly, was better able to organize the 50% donation, it soon began to receive more of the £20,000 than the *British Society*. In fact, by 1839, when the grant was increased to £30,000, about 80% of it went to Anglican schools.[2] Religious societies continued to be given the annual grant, though, after 1847, organizations other than the National Society and the British Society were entitled to share in it, thereby benefiting Catholics, Jews and those of other denominations.[3]

In 1839, six years after the first State grant to education, the Queen set up a Committee of the Privy Council for Education, under the Secretaryship of Dr. James Kay (afterwards Sir James Kay Shuttleworth), "for the consideration of all matters affecting the education of the people," and "to superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting public education."[4] This was "the first governmental body responsible for any form of education in modern England."[5] A most important and early result of this national administrative educational body was the institution, in 1840, of the position of Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools (H.M.I.), to ensure the inspection of all schools eligible to receive grants. Because of pressure from the Anglicans, a Concordat was issued decreeing that the Church of England would approve inspectors of schools of that denomination, the inherent result being that these were invariably clergymen.[6] However, it was decided that only laymen could be members of the Committee of Council in order that they might not be viewed as representatives of the churches.[7] By far, the foremost factor in the slow development of any truly state controlled elementary system centered on what came to be known as the "religious difficulty," essentially, a struggle between the various religious denominations and secular organizations concerning who would hold the reins of power in a state system and concerning whether or not religion would be taught in schools and what form it would take. This conflict between the rival claims of religion and secularism over the control of schools and their curricula was bitter and lasted for most of the century. As Jarman writes, it "continually checked educational development and made it slow and laborious" and for a long time it proved to be an exceedingly difficult obstacle in the way of establishing any real state system of education.[8]

Nevertheless, though still painfully slow, the encroachment of the government into the educational sphere continued, as did the state's expenditure in this area. For example, in 1846, the state entered the area of teacher training when Kay Shuttleworth–who, earlier, in 1840, had established his own teacher training college in London at Battersea–drew up his Minute on teacher training whereby grants were awarded to apprentice and certificated teachers.[9] Then, from 1853, rural schools were eligible to receive capitation grants for the encouragement of regular attendance. As it was soon found impossible to confine this capitation grant to poorer, country localities, it was quickly extended to schools throughout the nation, even those in towns.[10] Thus, the Committee of Council was responsible for paying out three major grants: the grant for the erection of school buildings, the grant for the training of teachers, and the capitation grant. In addition to these three expenditures, it was the responsibility of the Committee of Council to "make grants for the purchase of books and apparatus, and afford a certain degree of aid to the education of the children of vagrants and to that of other children who cannot properly be allowed to associate with the families of respectable parents." However, the government gave no financial aid for the education of paupers and those in prisons and reformatories.[11] With all these expenses, it is not surprising that the amount of the grant voted each year increased until, by 1859, it had risen to £723,115, not perhaps an inconsequential amount. However, this pales into some insignificance when set beside the nearly

£78,000,000 spent on the Crimean War.[12] Still, Barnard is correct in observing that the tentative period of state involvement was over: "henceforward the Government was committed to a definite policy in educational administration."[13]

Report of the Newcastle Commission

As the 1850s drew to a close, significant advances had been made in the educational sphere since the first state grant in 1833. Nevertheless, there was some agreement among interested parties throughout the country that the condition of education still left much to be desired and that the education of the lower classes was frequently appallingly lacking. As a reaction to mounting criticism, in 1858, there was appointed a Royal Commission chaired by the Duke of Newcastle, the aim of which was "to inquire into the Present State of Popular Education in England, and to consider and report what Measures, if any, are required for the Extension of sound and cheap Elementary Instruction to all Classes of the People." Though the government was intent on extending education it was a *sine qua non* that it be "cheap," because of the run on the coffers due to the Crimean War.[14] Indeed, Gladstone, himself, was particularly keen to reduce the education budget.[15] The Commission's findings were a mixture of praise and criticism for England's elementary schools. It was clearly recognized that progress had been made at the elementary level since the early decades of the century when the rigid monitorial system of Bell and Lancaster held sway. More children were now attending school, the figure adduced being 1 in 7.7 of the population (the figure in 1851 was 1 in 8.36).[16] However, the frequent irregularity and uncertainty of this attendance was not conducive to good education. Moreover, very few stayed on after the age of thirteen. "The statistics of school attendance . . . show that the children of the poorer classes are usually sent to school, with more or less regularity, in the more favorable cases until they are about 12, and in the less favorable cases until they are about 10 years old."[17] By no means, did everyone want working class children to remain at school into the teen-age years. As one of the Assistant Commissioners, James Fraser, reported:

> Even if it were possible, I doubt whether it would be desirable, with a view to the real interests of the peasant boy, to keep him at school till he was 14 or 15 years of age. But it is not possible. We must make up our minds to see the last of him, as far as the day school is concerned, at 10 or 11. We must frame our system of education upon this hypothesis; and I venture to maintain that it is quite possible to teach a child soundly and thoroughly, in a way that he shall not forget it, all that it is necessary for him to possess in the shape of intellectual attainment, by the time that he is 10 years old.[18]

Though not everyone would have advocated that all children should leave school at such an early age, most of the Commissioners would have agreed that children of working class parents should, themselves, adopt the practical attributes of that class. As Gordon and Lawton observe, "The Newcastle Report is often quoted as a classic example of a nineteenth-century official document recommending an elementary curriculum which was not only limited but deliberately inferior."[19] Still, one of the major findings of the Commission was the inadequacy of the basic education received by the young pupils: "the junior classes in the schools, comprehending the great majority of the children, do not learn, or learn imperfectly, the most necessary part of what they come to learn--reading, writing and arithmetic."[20]

There were differences of opinion among the Commissioners over the continuance of the Government grant. A minority held that the state had no responsibility in providing education except to the very poor or criminal. However, the majority considered it proper that the state should assist in the maintenance of education. Accordingly, the Commissioners proposed that

the future governmental grant be based on three features–attendance, the condition of the school buildings, and the H.M.I.'s report–and that a system of "payment by results" be introduced. As a method of accountability it was proposed:

> to institute a searching examination by competent authority of every child in every school to which grants are to be paid, with the view of ascertaining whether these indispensable elements of knowledge are thoroughly acquired, and to make the prospects and position of the teacher dependent, to a considerable extent, on the results of this examination. If teachers had a motive of this kind to see that all the children under their charge really learned to read, write, and cipher thoroughly well, there can be little doubt that they would generally find means to secure that result, and the presence of such a motive would do more towards the production of the required effect than any remodeling of the training college system. . . .there can be no sort of doubt that if (a teacher) finds that his income depends on the condition that his scholars do learn to read, whilst (another teacher) is paid equally well whether they do so or not, the first will teach more children to read than the second. . . .The object is to find some constant and stringent motive to induce them to do that part of their duty which is at once most unpleasant and most important. Every security is at present taken to enable them to do it, and to show them that it ought to be done, but sufficient effort is not made to ascertain that it really is done. The alterations which we recommend will, we trust, supply this omission.[21]

It is possible that some today might be shocked by the Commissioners' emphasis on the financial aspect of education and the necessity of accountability. However, this was in keeping with the period's pervasive Utilitarian philosophy and the typical Victorian desire to obtain value for money spent by the Government. "The Commissioners held the common view of the period that the notion of accountability, so vital to a well-run business, should be applied vigorously to all forms of government expenditure."[22] In fact, an American educationist, Isaac Sharpless, President of Haverford College, Pennsylvania, writing in 1892 towards the end of the system, implied that paying by results was peculiarly suited to the English psyche: "It satisfies the Englishman's idea of fairness, and of the propriety of equivalence rendered for public money expended."[23] However, the Newcastle Commissioners were by no means the first to suggest this principle as there had been a number of precedents during the previous couple of decades. Payment by results had been associated with the pupil-teacher system of 1846, whereby the salaries of the trainee teachers and their teachers depended on success in the yearly examination. Another scheme, initiated in 1853, had the Committee of Council paying a capitation grant to schools provided that a certain proportion of pupils passed an examination conducted by an H.M.I. However, this system of accountability did not last very long due to inspectors' lack of time, their neglect and absence of consistency. In the late 1850s, The Department of Science and Art also employed a similar scheme whereby science and drawing teachers could receive a bonus for meritorious answering by their pupils in annual examinations.[24] Nevertheless, there was no recommendation by the Commissioners for a state system, nor was education to be free, nor was it to be compulsory. In deciding against compulsion it was declared that:

> independence is of more importance than education; and if the wages of the child's labor are necessary, either to keep the parents from the poor rates, or to relieve the pressure of severe and bitter poverty, it is far better that it should go to work at the earliest age at which it can bear the physical exertion than that it should remain at school. There can be no doubt that this necessity sometimes exists.[25]

Moreover, state compulsion was viewed by the Commissioners as being distinctly un-English. The administrators of any such system "would be brought into collision with the constitution of English society and the habits and feelings of the people."[26]

The Revised Code and Payment by Results Proposed

In a nation where any educational question invariably provoked wide discussion, it was natural that the Report of the Newcastle Commissioners engendered heated debate, and not least in the Committee of Council. In parliament, on July 11, 1861, the last day of the session, Robert Lowe, Vice-President of the Education Department, responded to the findings and recommendations of the Report. He considered that there were four main criticisms made by the Commission of the workings of the Education Department: one, that the existing organization was too expensive; two, that the instruction provided was defective; three, that the system was excessively complex; and, four, that remote rural areas and the poorer parts of towns were not being well served. He agreed that the expenditure was exorbitant and that it was now essential to introduce economies. Similarly, he found certain justice in the Commissioners' complaint regarding the deficient instruction, declaring that the Committee of Council may have been wrong in failing to provide some accountability concerning the quality of the teaching: "we think it quite possible that we have erred in not devising some machinery for testing more particularly the results. So far we may have something to answer for, if reading, writing, and arithmetic have not so much attention paid to them as they ought."[27] He also assented to the complaint concerning the complexity of the prevailing system, explaining that the Committee of Council had to deal with over 6,000 managers of schools and to pay by post 23,000 certificated teachers and pupil-teachers, an immense bureaucracy which entailed "enormous expense and labor." The last of the Commissioners' criticisms, that under the present system it was impossible for some of the more remote country areas and some of the poorer parts of the towns to contribute sufficient funds for matching the governmental grant, was also accepted by Lowe. However, he believed that as things now stood little could be done to rectify this problem: "the evil complained of cannot, although it may be mitigated, be, under present circumstances, obviated."[28]

Turning to the Commissioners' recommendations for reform, Lowe diplomatically rejected most of them (the principle of payment by results he did indeed accept) in favor of proposals, mainly drawn up by Ralph Lingen (Kay Shuttleworth's successor as Secretary to the Committee of Council) and himself, which he declared would be embodied in a Minute to be placed before the Commons as soon as possible.[29] He was sanguine that the complexity of the existing system could be eliminated by simplifying the method of paying the teachers and pupil-teachers. He proposed–this was also recommended by the Commissioners–that payment was to be made directly to the managers who would discharge the funds to the teachers, thereby eliminating the need of the Committee of Council to pay by mail each individual teacher and pupil-teacher.[30] In addition, the augmentation grants to both kinds of teachers instituted by the 1846 Minutes were to be abolished and a system of capitation grants was to be substituted. Certain conditions had to be satisfied before payment of the capitation grant: it was to be based on the number of attendances of pupils above a certain number; the inspector had to determine that the school was in a fit state; the teacher was to be certificated. Furthermore, Lowe proposed an annual examination of each pupil in the three R's to be conducted by the inspector:

> If a child pass in the whole the full capitation grant will be given; but if he fail in writing, for instance, one-third of the grant will be withdrawn; if he fail in both reading and writing two-thirds will be withheld; while if he fail in reading, writing, and arithmetic, no portion of the grant will be paid.[31]

This was the system which was to become generally known as payment by results, though, as we have seen, analogous systems had existed earlier. A prime motivation was to ensure "that the capitation grant, when paid, shall be paid only upon our being reasonably satisfied that the desired results have been attained." It was also a declared objective "to secure, as far as possible, that the attention of the master shall not be confined to the upper

class of his school, but shall be given to the whole, and we endeavor to effect that object by making the payment of the capitation grant depend upon the manner in which [the teacher] has instructed each child."[32] As was laid out more specifically, two and a half weeks later in the Minute, pupils were to be examined according to four groups: Group I for children aged between 3 and 7, Group II for those between 7 and 9, Group III for those between 9 and 11, Group IV for those aged 11 and upwards. No grant could be claimed a second time by a child who had once passed in Group IV. This effectively signified that children over 11 were not eligible for grants.[33]

Lowe was convinced of the benefits which would necessarily result from these proposals. The Privy Council, itself, would remain unaltered; only the method of payment would change, a simpler, more convenient method being substituted for a more complex one. Managers would be enabled to go about their jobs with greater ease. A teacher would have a much greater incentive to teach well: if his pupils failed, he would be disgraced before his manager; if they did well, he would be praised and be in a position to rise in his profession. The emphasis, Lowe was categorical, was now to be on efficiency and quantifiable results. As he declared, neatly applying his political philosophy to the educational sphere, "Hitherto we have been living under a system of bounties and protection; now we propose to have a little free trade."[34] Of course, Lowe's advocacy of the forces of political economy was totally in keeping with the period's utilitarian, laissez-faire, and entrepreneurial *Zeitgeist*, as well as the Government's earnest desire to cut down on educational expenditure.[35] On July 29, 1861 the Minute was published.

Reactions to Lowe's Proposals

Lowe's recommendations, especially those relating to making payment depend on results, engendered vociferous reactions among both his fellow educationists and his countrymen at large. An excellent source of hundreds of critiques is contained in Vol. LXI of *British Parliamentary Papers* under the heading "Copies of all Memorials and Letters which have been addressed to the Lord President of the Council or to the Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education, on the Subject of the Revised Code, by the Authorities of any Educational Society, Board, or Committee, or of any Training School."[36] A letter particularly antagonistic to Lowe's proposals was sent on 4 November 1861, to Earl Granville by James Kay Shuttleworth who even came out of retirement to found an Anti-Code Committee. In this letter Kay Shuttleworth displayed contempt for Lowe's notion that "a little free trade" should be introduced into the educational process. The moral sphere of education had nothing to do with political economy. Teachers should not be tested as "corn and cotton" and "be subject to the law of supply and demand."[37] He also argued that the valuable time of the inspectors which would now be devoted to the "mechanical drudgery" of examining each pupil individually would be wasted, thereby leaving him far too little time to attend to the religious and moral climate of the school, and its general organization. Moreover, the inspector, he believed, was by no means always the best person to conduct the examination of the children, for they were often nervous in the presence of a stranger and refused to answer him. Indeed, they frequently failed to understand his questions: "The very refinement, gentleness, and scholastic accuracy of the inspector often puts them out." The examination would be all the more useless if the inspector possessed an abrupt manner and spoke harshly:

> He will get few juniors to read without strange hesitation and mistakes. Few will write correctly 1,000,003 from dictation. Very few will write with their usual skill. A large portion will fail in arithmetical trials, which they would have passed with ease if the clergyman or the master had examined them. Thus the true state of the school is often not known to the inspector. Experienced inspectors make allowance for these hindrances in their estimate of the state of the schools under

> the present form of inspection. That would not, however, be possible if an inspector had to deal with purely mechanical results, as in the examinations in the Revised Code.[38]

Furthermore, a proper national policy, Kay Shuttleworth was convinced, could not rely on theories of "short-sighted economy." It was utterly wrong to imagine that the lower classes could be treated as mere "beasts of burden" with no attention being paid to the development of their intelligence, moral well-being, and duties as citizens.

C. H. Browby argued in The Times that it was an error not to take into account such factors as pupils' poor attendance due to the various problems of their home life as well as their ignorance when first admitted to school:

> If the code professes to recompense a man in proportion to the work which he has done, surely the amount of knowledge which a child brings with him to the school is as important an element of assessment as the positive knowledge which the inspector elicits, or the number of days which the child has passed under instruction.[39]

A speech of another prominent critic, the Right Rev. Lord Auckland, Bishop of Bath and Wells, was reported in The Times. The Bishop was manifestly contemptuous of Lowe's and Lingen's understanding of a child's nature, believing that examining very young children served little educational purpose.[40] This was a sentiment held by others also, the proposed testing of infants being excoriated in the press. In addition, the Bishop criticized the proposal to stop the payment of grants to children over eleven years of age, since this, in effect, would determine eleven as the school leaving age of the vast majority of children, an age he considered far too low. He was also concerned about the grouping by age which he alleged would be injurious to both the clever and the weak pupil. Furthermore, he complained--and this was to be echoed again and again--that the new Minute signified that less attention would now be paid to religion because of the inevitable concentration on the money-making three R's. One group which strenuously voiced this latter criticism, in a petition made to the Education Department on 10 December 1861, was a deputation of managers, directors, and school teachers representing Church of England educational interests. Furthermore, though the deputies were by no means adverse to the actual principle of payment by results, they complained that under Lowe's proposals no attention would be paid to the background of the individual school or individual pupil, that the education of children over eleven would be impeded, and that the very young would earn very little thereby slowing the advancement of infant schools.[41] In like manner, an article in the January 1862 issue of the Tory Quarterly Review gave the proposals for payment by results short shrift, though the author was at pains to stress that his quarrel with the Revised Code was not that it aimed at results but that the proposed plans "for testing results" were so abysmal.[42]

The reaction was by no means all adversely critical. Three letters which appeared in The Times on 2 November 1861, are examples of endorsements of Lowe's plans. These praised, if not all features, at least the essential terms of Lowe's proposals. The Canon of Bristol, Edward Girdlestone, wrote that the new Code, among other benefits, would be particularly advantageous to the children of the poor since it would ensure that they would receive a sound foundation which would enable them to continue their education after school.[43] Another letter, written by an anonymous clergyman, argued that making teachers' salaries dependent on their students' answering well in an examination was reasonable and appropriate.[44] In the third letter, the correspondent, "R. W. A.," praised the accountability feature of the Code, especially in view of the great increase in government financial commitment to education:

> Indeed, whatever objections may lie against the details of the scheme, it seems evident that paying for the results is better than paying for the machinery of education. The taxpayer, too, may well be thankful that means have been taken to arrest an expenditure which of late years has been alarmingly on the increase.[45]

Lowe Counters with a Revised Code

The personnel of the Committee of Council hearkened carefully to the criticism, negative and positive, of the proposals and on February 13, 1862, Lowe presented a revised Code to the House. He agreed with the Newcastle Report that far too many children were in schools unassisted by any governmental grant, sometimes having little connection to the Privy Council.[46] However, it was essential, he felt, that these districts which contributed money equally with those which were connected with the Privy Council should now be in receipt of some share of the revenue. To accomplish this it was frequently suggested that a lower type of teacher be introduced. This action would serve to underscore the important issue of accountability according to Lowe. For the:

> present system sets everything on the teaching. If the teacher be a good one, the end for which the grants are given is attained. If the teacher be a bad one, it fails. We have no real check on the teaching to any great extent. It seems to me that the only possible condition under which, without a reckless expenditure of public money, we can possibly recommend that teachers of an inferior class be employed in these schools would be on the understanding that there shall be some collateral and independent proof that such teachers do their duty. And that I think it will appear is only to be found in a system of individual examination.[47]

Teachers must be accountable for their results. This conviction went hand-in-hand with an eagerness to ensure that a good return be made on the grants paid:

> Once we pay over the money, we cannot follow it to the uses to which it is applied; but we can be satisfied that it is well applied on the whole, and make our grants dependent on that. I believe that the only substitute for this circumlocution and red tape–the only check on managers–is not to be had by the payment of teachers, but by the examination of the pupils.[48]

Lowe went on, in carefully worded language, to reveal his doubts about the inspectors' ability, under the present system, to assess in any quantifiable form the educational level of a school and the effectiveness of the teachers, concluding "that inspection as opposed to examination is not, and never can be, a test of the efficiency of a system of national education."[49] Moreover, he considered that the inspectors tended to bestow the grant no matter whether the school was functioning well or poorly, reprehensible behavior to Lowe who strongly believed that the purpose of the annual grant was to ensure efficiency: "What is the object of inspection? Is it simply to make things pleasant, to give the schools as much as can be got out of the public purse, independent of their efficiency; or do you mean that our grants should not only be aids, subsidies, and gifts, but fruitful of good? That is the question, and it meets us at every turn." The clear answer to Lowe was that the duty of the Government was to bestow the grant if the school were good and deny it if it were bad: "We must hold out a prospect of sufficient remuneration if the children are properly taught, and of loss if they are not, or we shall do nothing." Above all, it was essential "that the public get an equivalent for the expenditure."[50]

The Newcastle Commission had recommended that part of the capitation grant should depend on the H.M.I.'s report and the pupils' attendance, and part on the results of examination. This, however, was not favored by Lowe who clearly did not trust his inspectors. Rather,

he proposed a grant completely dependent on the pupils' performance in the three R's.[51] He allowed that all or part of the grant would be denied in certain cases; for example, if the school was inadequately lighted, drained, or ventilated, if the teacher was not properly certificated, if the registers were inaccurately kept, if plain needlework was not taught to the girls, "or if there are any gross faults in the management of the school." However, the main factor determining a school's grant depended on the efficiency of the teacher which was to be gauged by the pupils' performance in the inspector's examination in the three R's. Taking the earlier criticism of infant examination to heart, Lowe now proposed that children below the age of six were to be eligible for the capitation grant without being examined, though he advised that the grant for this age group should be less than for older children. However, he refused to allow day school pupils aged over eleven to obtain grants, these being "mostly children for whom the schools were not intended."[52] On the other hand, he proposed to reduce the age from thirteen to twelve at which children could enter evening school. It is worthwhile to quote a long passage from Lowe's speech in the Commons on 13 February 1862, in which he presented the chief features of his Revised Code. Though many specific amendments were made in the details before the Code became law later in the year, the following extract encapsulates the main utilitarian principle on which the Code was based and which many contemporary and later critics damned as being essentially contrary to the very notion of true education:

> The true principle is not to lower your standard to meet cases which are at present below it, but to do what you can to induce them to amend themselves, and if they will not amend themselves, to leave them to the unaided support of voluntary efforts, but not to degrade the whole system for their sake. I think there is no reason, therefore, for this apprehension with regard to loss. We know that there will be a loss where the teaching is inefficient. That is our principle, that where the teaching is inefficient the schools should lose. I cannot promise the House that this system will be an economical one, and I cannot promise that it will be an efficient one, but I can promise that it shall be either one or the other. If it is not cheap it shall be efficient; if it is not efficient it shall be cheap. The present is neither one nor the other. If the schools do not give instruction the public money will not be demanded, but if instruction is given the public money will be demanded--I cannot say to what amount, but the public will get value for its money.[53]

Lowe understood very well some of the objections to his proposals, an important one being the Church of England's fear that the teaching of religion would now receive less attention from the inspectors. He was at pains to disabuse critics of this worry. The inspectors were to interfere in no way with the religious teaching in schools of denominations other than the established Church; however, in the latter schools, according to the 10 August 1840 Concordat, it was, indeed, their duty to examine and report on religious instruction. As Lowe declared, "If the Report on religious matters is adverse, we have no alternative but to withdraw the grant altogether. That was the same in the old, as it is in the new Code; no change whatever has been made in regard to it."[54] Lowe also defended the grouping of children by age for examination, arguing that it would act as an impetus to get the children of the poor into school at the earliest possible age. In addition, he brusquely dismissed the criticism that attendance on the day of examination was subject to uncertainty due to such factors as sickness, weather, bad roads and so on, declaring that "'Haec est conditio viventi'; and while we act upon general rules we cannot avoid such contingencies."

Perhaps the chief objection to the plans was that education would be degraded by this process of payment by results, a charge Lowe staunchly denied, maintaining that the object in view was a minimum, not a maximum, of education. Though grants would only be awarded if the children performed adequately in the three R's, there was no reason, he declared, why other subjects should not be learned: "We do not object to any amount of learning; the only question is, how much of that knowledge we ought to pay for."[55] Certainly, the main

emphasis was to be on the basic subjects; but, in Lowe's opinion, if teachers properly instructed in these, education would be far from degraded. Nevertheless, the ultra-conservative Lowe, who, as Sturt remarks, possessed "a pathological loathing of democracy," was convinced that the children for whom the Revised Code was intended, those of the poor classes, did not really require more than the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic.[56] There was to be little social mobility in Lowe's world. "We do not profess to give these children an education that will raise them above their station and business in life; that is not our object, but to give them an education that may fit them for that business."[57] Especially important was the wish to make education accountable: "we are about to substitute for the vague and indefinite test which now exists, a definite, clear, and precise test, so that the public may know exactly what consideration they get for their money."[58]

Reactions to Lowe's Revised Code

Immediately after Lowe had presented the outline of his Revised Code, Disraeli rose to speak and bitterly implied that he intended to have the new Minute pass into law without first going through the usual process of a House debate. This, Disraeli stressed, was to be especially avoided as the proposed new regulations were of great importance, "too vast and elaborate for any hasty criticism," and he hoped that Parliament would meet "to pronounce maturely upon the subject."[59] He prevailed and March 25, 1862, was fixed as the day of debate. For the next six weeks it seemed as if the country was being swept by an avalanche of opinion on Lowe's Code, most of it antagonistic. Indeed, it has been reckoned that about a thousand petitions criticizing the Code had been delivered to Parliament before March 1862 "and only one (with one signature) in favor."[60]

There is no space to provide a thorough account of the diverse arguments for and against Lowe's latest proposals. In particular, an analysis of teachers' reactions would require a lengthy paper in itself. Still, it may be stated that, while some teachers, especially the Voluntaryists who saw it as heralding a curtailment in State involvement in the educational sphere, welcomed the principle of the Code, most abhorred the proposed methods.[61] Heated opinions originated from other quarters also. It will be useful to mention just a few of the numerous positive and negative criticisms. The House of Lords was the scene of a number of speeches on the subject. In a speech on 4 March 1862, the Bishop of Oxford contended eloquently and vehemently against the imposition of payment by results, arguing that the new method of examination was far inferior in an overall educational sense than the old. For the old system checked a school's moral, intellectual, and religious climate and tested that the pupils were educated in far more than the mere mechanical knowledge of the basic three R's. But, if the new proposals were accepted, the only results rewarded would be "the poorest results," constituting "the very worst criterion of the progress of education."[62] However, three days later in a letter to The Times, "A Hertfordshire Incumbent" took the Bishop to task, maintaining that the duty of the H.M.I. was "precisely the same" under both the old and new Codes, "*with the addition* of the special instruction" under the new one to conduct an individual examination of the pupils in the three R's. The latest proposals still obliged the inspector to check the moral, intellectual, and religious progress of the children, the general climate of the school and capability of the teacher, and he was empowered to make deductions in the grant if any defects were recorded. Everything did not depend on passing the tests in reading, writing, and arithmetic.[63] The Duke of Marlborough, for his part, was worried about the effect of payment by results on teachers, speaking against what he feared might be the imbuing in them of "a mercantile spirit." There was a danger, he considered, that they might tend "to look upon their pupils as having a certain money value, and to neglect those whose instruction was not likely to be remunerative. The schoolmaster's pecuniary interests rather than the moral training of the child would be rather attended to." Teachers, the Duke continued, would also be exposed to the temptation of falsifying returns in order to gain greater remuneration, though he was little convinced that any would succumb.[64]

Perhaps the most influential criticism of the proposed payment by results, and certainly the most caustic, was an article by the H.M.I., Matthew Arnold, which he published in Fraser's Magazine in March 1862. It was a courageous piece, for Arnold, besides ridiculing the educational and cultural inadequacies of the Code, attacked what he held to be the machinations of his superiors in the Education Office. It is true that the article was anonymous, but it is certain that Lowe and Lingen were in no doubt about the identity of the author. With regard to the proposed payment by results, Arnold, though accepting that certain examining by inspectors was inevitable no matter what system was employed, criticized the annual examination of individual children in the three R's for being the sole arbiter of whether or not the school received any money from the State. The inspector's work would be purely mechanical:

> It turns the inspectors into a set of registering clerks, with a mass of minute details to tabulate, such a mass as must, in Sir James Shuttleworth's words, "necessarily withdraw their attention from the religious and general instruction, and from the moral features of the school." In fact, the inspector will just hastily glance round the school, and then he must fall to work at the "log-books." And this to ascertain the precise state of each individual scholar's reading, writing, and arithmetic. As if there might not be in a school most grave matters needing inspection and correction; as if the whole school might not be going wrong, at the same time that a number of individual scholars might carry off prizes for reading, writing, and arithmetic! It is as if the generals of an army--for the inspectors have been the veritable generals of the educational army--were to have their duties limited to inspecting the men's cartouch-boxes. The organization of the army is faulty, inspect the cartouch-boxes! The camp is ill-drained, the men are ill-hutted, there is danger of fever and sickness. Never mind; inspect the cartouch-boxes! But the whole discipline is out of order, and needs instant reformation; no matter; inspect the cartouch-boxes! But the army is beginning a general movement and that movement is a false one; it is moving to the left when it should be moving to the right; it is going to a disaster! That is not your business; inspect, inspect the cartouch-boxes![65]

And the sole result of the new system, Arnold was convinced, would be the inevitable decline in the education of the people. On March 25, 1862, Arnold, under the nom-de-plume "A Lover of Light," published a letter, "The 'Principle of Examination,'" in the Daily News. Again, acknowledging that the value of examination was undeniable, he queried whether testing should constitute the sole measure of deciding the amount of the grant. For he believed that such a pervasive system of examination was totally inappropriate for the working class pupils who made up the vast majority of those who benefited from the government grant. Arnold provided the example of a school in a poor area of London:

> In London, in a school filled with the children (not infants) of poor weavers of Spitalfields, every child will under the Revised Code be examined by the inspector. Great numbers of them will fail: so backward are they, so long neglected, so physically feeble. Yet most of the good they get, they get from that school. But now the "principle of examination" is to become a reality. There is to be no "shrinking." It is to be "no work no pay." The grant will sink to nothing, and the school managers will be left to enjoy perfect "liberty of action."[66]

John Scott of the Wesleyan Training Institution, Westminster, was another who had the poorest class of children in mind, considering that the Revised Code would act totally against their interests and only serve to keep them prostrate: "Is a child less rational, less capable of intellectual and moral improvement . . . because his parents are poor? . . . What reason can be assigned, of which the persons assigning it ought not be ashamed, why a poor man's child ought to have only a poor education?"[67]

The Revised Code and Payment by Results Passed and Set in Motion

The furor continued, culminating in a series of debates in Parliament on March 25 and 27, 1862, which centered primarily on eleven resolutions, moved by Spencer Walpole, highly critical of many aspects of Lowe's proposals. A detailed account of the debates is not necessary as nothing dramatically new was introduced in the arguments for or against the Code. Then, on March 28, Robert Lowe announced what were to be final concessions by the Government, the principal ones were that a substantial portion of the annual grant would depend on the inspector's general report and that the principle of grouping children by age would be given up.[68] The actual Code was finally issued on May 9, its essential features being in many respects quite close to the recommendations of the Newcastle Commission. The annual grant, "to promote the education of children belonging to the classes who support themselves by manual labor," was still intended to supplement voluntary efforts, to aid only those schools associated with some religious denomination or where a daily reading from the authorized version of the Scriptures was given. In addition, schools were only eligible for a grant which allowed themselves to be inspected by one of Her Majesty's inspectors. Pupils were obliged to satisfy the inspector that they had attended for a minimum number of times in the year. It was possible for a school to meet three times a day, namely in the morning, afternoon, and evening, and, in order to receive a grant, a school had to meet more than once a day. For a single attendance to be counted it was directed that a pupil be present for at least two hours in either a morning or afternoon session or at least one and a half hours in the evening. A pupil was not allowed to combine evening with morning or afternoon sessions to make up the requisite attendances. In addition, a pupil had to be over 12 years of age to count evening sessions.

Stipulated were the amounts forfeited for failing to pass the inspector's test. There were six standards in which pupils could be examined, an important provision being that a child, whether he passed or failed the first time, could not be examined a second time in the same or a lower standard. Under the terms of the Code, an inspector was empowered, in certain circumstances, to reduce the size of the grant or withhold it altogether:

(a) If the school be not held in a building certified by the inspector to be healthy, properly lighted, drained, and ventilated, supplied with offices, and containing in the principal school-room at least 80 cubical feet of internal space for each child in average attendance.

(b) If the principal teacher be not duly certificated and duly paid. (A fuller explanation of this is provided in the Code)

(c) If the girls in the school be not taught plain needlework as part of the ordinary course of instruction.

(d) If the registers be not kept with sufficient accuracy to warrant confidence in the returns.

(e) If, on the inspector's report, there appears to be any *prima facie* objection of a gross kind. (In Church of England Schools, the Order in Council of 10th August 1840 and the instructions to inspectors relative to examination in religion, which are founded upon it, are included under this paragraph). A second inspection, wherein another inspector or inspectors take part, is made in every such instance, and if the grant be finally withheld, a special minute is made and recorded of the case.

(f) If three persons at least be not designated to sign the receipt for the grant on behalf of the school.[69]

The inspector could cause the grant to be reduced for faults in the teacher's instruction or discipline, for the manager's failure to maintain the school in a condition conducive to efficiency, and for various other reasons. Detailed rules were also laid down regarding the keeping of a log-book. Most of the rest of the Revised Code was concerned with rules respecting teachers who were divided into three categories: a) certificated teachers; b) pupil-teachers; c) assistant teachers.

In September 1862, the Committee of Council on Education set out very specific instructions to the inspectors concerning the administration of the annual examination. Inspectors were advised that the test in the three R's "of individual children according to a certain standard must always be, to a considerable extent, mechanical."[70] Indeed, the Committee of Council went out of its way to prescribe in very precise, mechanical terms how H.M.I.'s might proceed with these tests, though it was stated that the instructions were not obligatory, that other methods could be employed, and that allowance had to be made for the particular school being examined.

The regulations underwent alterations during the thirty-five-year history of payment by results. Changes were frequently made in details of the annual Codes and periodically totally new Codes were issued. Revised instructions to inspectors were also issued at intervals. However, the underlying principle of the system persevered, with governmental grants continuing to be viewed essentially as a reward for results attained. Presumably, as a reaction to criticism of the dominance of the three R's, the Minute of 20 February 1867, provided that schools under certain conditions could be eligible for extra grants if pupils passed an examination in "specific subjects."[71] In 1871, it was allowed that everyday-pupils in the upper levels, who passed an examination in not more than two such subjects, could earn an additional grant per subject. Quite a variety of subjects were proposed, particular prominence being placed on Geography, History, Algebra, English Grammar or Literature, Elements of Latin, French or German, Physical Geography, and Animal Physiology.[72] Four years later, in 1875, "class subjects" were introduced "according to the average number of children, above 7 years of age, in attendance throughout the year," if the class as a whole passed well in any two subjects from Grammar, History, Elementary Geography, and Plain Needlework. Another change was the grant provided for each pupil, according to the average number in yearly attendance. If singing were included in the curriculum, an additional grants was given. Likewise, if the discipline and organization of the school were "satisfactory" in the opinion of the inspector. As a minor attempt to provide for more advanced pupils, it was allowed that a pupil who had already passed Standard VI could be examined in up to three "specific subjects" for a grant of 4s. per subject. An influential addition to the 1875 Code was the stipulation that "no scholar who has made the prescribed number of attendances may (without a reasonable excuse for absence on the day of the inspector's visit) be withheld from examination."[73] The next major changes to the system of payment by results were those contained in the Code of 1882, the most important of which was the "merit grant," which was primarily introduced to reward answering of good quality. This was clearly the Education Department's response to the widespread criticism that schools all too often were aiming at the basic minimum required to satisfy the conditions of the annual examination. Changes were also made in the 1882 Code in the method of assessing the basic grant in the elementary subjects. The principal change was that the grant was now to be:

> determined by the percentage of passes in the examination at the rate of 1d. for every unit of percentage. . . .The percentage of passes [was to] be determined by the ratio of the passes actually made to those that might have been made by all scholars liable to examination who are either examined or are absent or withheld from the examination without reasonable excuse.[74]

Taking heed of diverse criticism in the 1888 Cross Commission, especially of payment by results, the Education Department drew up another new Code in 1890. There were numerous specific changes in the method of awarding grants, the most significant of which was the substitution of one principal grant for the three individual grants in the elementary subjects. Moreover, the inspector was no longer required to examine each pupil individually; testing by sample was introduced, the only stipulation being that at least one third of the pupils were to be examined individually. However, individual testing was retained for the "specific subjects."[75] Another change was the amount for the merit grant and the grant for discipline and organization.[76] By now, not much remained of the system of payment by results as introduced by Lowe in 1862. Further alterations were laid out in the "The Day School Code (1895)" which heralded the end of the formal annual examination by the H.M.I. The chief innovation was that the inspector's annual visit could be substituted by occasional visits, as a rule two to be made without notice. It was intended "that this provision should be applied to schools which have reached upon the whole a good educational standard, and that only those schools should in future be annually examined to which, in the judgment of the inspector, it is necessary to apply a more exact test of efficiency."[77] Two years later, in 1897, Lowe's payment by results was finally no more.

Effects of Payment by Results

One of the major motivations for introducing the Revised Code and the system of payment by results was to economize on governmental expenditure, and such saving was immediately realized in the early years after implementation. The grant for each year from 1861 to 1865 was, respectively, £813,441; £774,743; £721,386; £655,036; £636,806–dramatic decreases, all the more marked considering that average attendances had risen each year.[78] Lowe's prediction about saving money had been proven true. This reduction in expenditure was not to last, however, since from the mid-1860s onwards, the parliamentary grant began to increase; and understandably so, due to changes being made to successive Codes, the great expansion introduced by the 1870 Education Act, and an ever-growing awareness that an enlarged educational provision must be overseen by the Government. But payment by results effected many other changes in numerous aspects of elementary education besides financial ones, as will be pointed out in the following sections. It must be stated, however, that to provide any adequate account of the three-and-a-half-decades reign of payment by results necessitates employing generalizations for which exceptions may be adduced. There were numerous school districts in England and Wales overseen by many H.M.I.'s at any given time; and, of course, over a period of thirty odd years, school districts changed in area, in number of schools, in administration, and in various other ways, while inspectors were naturally replaced periodically due to retirement, death, and so on. In addition, the system of payment by results, itself–as indeed the whole educational system–by no means remained static, but was frequently subject to changes, some slight, some manifold. At any rate, it must be consistently borne in mind that while one inspector might praise the teaching of arithmetic, reading, geography or some other subject in a school in his district at a given time, it is quite likely that another inspector, even in the same year, in a school not too far away, might tell a very different story.

Teachers

Before payment by results, teachers could be considered *quasi* civil servants since they received their salaries directly from the government. But this distinction was removed upon the implementation of the new system, most teachers thereby experiencing a manifest loss of status. Still, one inspector welcomed the teachers' break from their direct involvement with the state, believing that formerly they had little incentive to work to their keenest: "It has removed them from that quasi protection of the State which enervated their character and withdrew them from those general conditions of employment which assign merit and reward to those who earn it."[79] It is unlikely that many teachers would have been swayed by this argument, nor would many

have been pleased with the official decree that their professional competence could be satisfactorily gauged by the number of passes secured. Still, it is only natural that teachers, probably most, attempted to prove their quality by getting as many children as possible to pass. However, there was also another reason for teachers to emphasize pedagogy which would result in the greatest number of passes and to concentrate efforts on those pupils who had most likelihood of gaining the full grant. As the school managers often gave the teacher a small set salary and paid him as balance either the whole or a fixed percentage of the grant gained, it was obligatory for the teacher, if he were to survive, to secure as many passes and as large a grant as possible.[80] P. David Ellis quotes from the August 1865 manager's minutes of St. Stephen's School, Kirkstall, Yorkshire where the teachers' income was completely dependent upon the grant earned: "the master shall have one fourth of the government grant made to his school and the mistress one fourth of the government grant made to the girls and infants schools."[81] Under such circumstances, it is understandable that all too often the educational well-being of pupils became secondary to concerns about the teachers' own livelihoods.

The main difficulty was that there was never any certainty about the numbers of pupils who would pass annually. Perhaps for one reason or other, and not necessarily due to the fault of the teacher, the school may have been discredited, resulting in a low attendance during the year. Even when annual attendance was good, there was no guarantee that on the day of the examination every pupil would turn up. Sickness and epidemics, harvests and other seasonal work, bad weather could wreck havoc and, consequently, keep attendance low. The manifest problem for a teacher under such a system, as pointed out by Inspector Robinson in his 1867 Report, was that he lost 8s. for each pupil absent, thereby resulting in "a sore discouragement, which he does not fail to feel keenly, both on account of the labor of teaching thrown away as far as that day's result would show, and because it is so much bread from the mouths of his family."[82] Robinson also painted the scenario of a teacher taking over a disorganized and poorly taught school where most of the pupils had already been examined and failed in standards too high for them. As it was against the rules for the teacher to present them again at the same level, he had the option of declining to present them and thereby losing the grant, or presenting them at a higher and more difficult level "for the chance of earning something trifling in this as well as in future years."[83] Furthermore, as G.A.N. Lowndes points out, efforts to reduce the numerous exceedingly large classes might have been assayed "many years earlier if the salary of the teachers had not, in far too many cases, been paid out of the grant earned, making it to their interest to attempt to teach as many children as they could to secure rather than share the grant with additional teaching staff."[84] Nevertheless, some inspectors argued that the Revised Code had the beneficial effect of compelling poor teachers to pay greater attention to their duties. Mr. Kennedy, for instance, praised the result if not necessarily the means of payment by results:

> For managers will no longer go on putting up with a master whose scholars cannot earn an average grant, and in very many cases the master is stimulated by receiving a fixed share of what is earned by those scholars who pass. I have seen much good result in inferior schools from this double stimulus of fear and reward applied to teachers by the system of "payment by results," though whether this same good might not be accomplished in another way, and whether the system of "payment by results" has not certain grave objections, are other questions.[85]

It is understandable that teachers were often very nervous on the day of inspection. With so much of the salary dependent upon a good result "each year seem[ed] to leave the marks of increasing care and anxious toil on the appearance and manner of the teacher."[86] To the latter, the inspector was the supreme arbiter of his or her livelihood and how he conducted the examination was naturally observed with attention to all minute details: "Persons who have a money interest in every mark assigned, not infrequently stand by and watch each movement of his hand."[87] Indeed, a particularly sad effect of payment by results was that many teachers

came to regard the inspector as an adversary who was to be outwitted rather than as a helpful guide or colleague in the educational process.[88] "True, the system was cheap, but it had the effect of opening a rift between teachers and inspectors. There was already a wide social gap, but now there was distrust as well. Teachers concentrated on training their pupils for the minimum conditions of the grant regulations, by fair means or foul if some reports were to be believed. Inspectors had to counter any dishonesty."[89] One of the chief dishonest acts on the part of teachers concerned tampering with the all important attendance list, the processes of payment by results having led inexorably to "the cult of the register."[90] In fact, the Education Department laid down that if a fire broke out the teacher's first duty was to rescue the register![91] For the details reposing in this all important book were essential for determining certain grant eligibility, the 1862 Code having specified that only those pupils who had attended school at least 200 times in the year could qualify for the attendance grant. It is probable that some teachers did cheat, for the more children recorded as present on 200 days, the higher the grant, and, in all likelihood, the higher their salaries. As one inspector wrote in 1869: "The temptation must be very strong, the chances of detection next to impossible."[92] In fact, Inspector Binns advised that entries in the daily register should be marked in ink rather than pencil "as a safeguard against alterations and erasures" and that teachers should take care to leave no blank spaces in the columns.[93] Certainly, the inspector was rarely in a position to detect discrepancies in the register. Generally burdened with an onerous workload, he was usually able to pay only one visit a year to each school in his district, the day of the examination, the date of which had been communicated to the manager and teachers weeks in advance. However, the implementation of Article 12 in the Code of 1870 authorized inspectors to pay surprise visits to schools, resulting in reports of irregularities in the registers, though it is probable that many problems were more due to sheer carelessness on the part of both manager and teacher, rather than a desire to cheat.[94]

In most schools, in the early years of payment by results, what teachers received from the annual grant frequently did not amount to what they had previously earned as a fixed salary.[95] As a consequence, many became peripatetic, changing their positions from school to school in a search for greater remuneration. They were joined by the multitude who were sacked for securing poor grants; managers, declares Edmonds, "appointed and dismissed their teachers just as they ordered slates in preference to copy-books or vice-versa."[96] Many others, leaving teaching entirely, migrated to different occupations. Robinson had little doubt of the reason, declaring in 1869, that if teachers "were sufficiently paid any excuse for rapid change, under ordinary circumstances, would be taken away."[97] A natural result of the decline in salaries was a deterioration in good teaching and morale. Those new to the profession, it was stated by one inspector, were not of as high a caliber as those recruited between 1846, the year the pupil teacher system was initiated by the Committee of Council, and the commencement of the Revised Code: "as a rule, attainments and refinement seem inferior, the aims and aspirations seem lower, and they work with less spirit and zest."[98] However, Inspector Johnstone, adducing figures in 1867 from some schools within the South Lancashire district, did not agree that the lot of the teacher had worsened under payment by results, asserting that "it is impossible, at least in this district, to agree with the cry that salaries are diminished and a teacher's prospects blighted under the New Code."[99] Nor did Inspector Watkins reporting from South Yorkshire five years later agree:

> The salaries of teachers, compared with those of the learned professions, are not now in general much below the mark; they contrast favorably with the incomes of the clergy, who have spent ten times as much on their education, and on whom much greater social and charitable demands are made. Some teachers of elementary schools are receiving from 250l. to 300l. per annum, which is more than the average income of the clergy.[100]

These last two reports constitute a salutary reminder that one must take care in generalizing about the various conditions of all the schools in England and Wales under the new system.

Pupils

Though pupils who were likely to fail were frequently kept back from the annual examination, there is little doubt that, overall, more children received increased attention from their teachers during the era of payment by results. Everyone now counted equally–in a financial sense–that is, every pupil was eligible for the same grant if he or she passed the examination. Indeed, Inspector Temple declared that he knew "of no other means by which this result would have been obtained."[101] Moreover, the teacher tended to pay more attention to the weaker and more backward pupils also, children who had often been ignored as nuisances before payment by results: "it causes them to receive an amount of individual attention which they never received before, and thus it spreads over the whole school that instruction which under the old system was ever tending, more or less, to concentrate itself upon the most proficient scholars alone."[102] At the same time, there was a decline in simultaneous class teaching together with an increased concentration on preparing children for individual examination by the inspector, a method of pedagogy and testing much praised by many inspectors.[103]

However, many argued that brighter students were suffering because of the resultant striving for uniformity of attainments.[104] As Mr. Parez, though acknowledging the benefit which payment by results brought to less-gifted pupils, remarked in 1866, "the good may be somewhat neglected, the real talents of the brighter scholars not developed . . . . in the present system of examination, there is no such thing as an *honor* class; all are raised or degraded, as the case may be, to the one level of a *pass*."[105] For there was little financial incentive to bring on the clever child to realize his full capabilities. A. Sonnenschein, in Auberon Herbert's 1889 collection of letters, The Sacrifice of Education to Examination, made the point clear:

> Payment by results leads to the neglect of the better pupils in favor of the dullards; and even these are merely drilled and not taught, still less trained. The loss caused to the nation by the neglect of the talented children is probably the worst of the numerous evils entailed by our perverted system.[106]

Very bright students were not alone in being neglected, for weaker pupils, that is those perceived as unlikely to pass, often received little attention from teachers, especially in the weeks and months immediately preceding the examination. Only those who had a chance of being financially remunerative would be carefully prepared for the tests. Sometimes, dull children were refused admittance to schools altogether. Inspector Alderson remarked, in 1865, that someone had proposed "that it will soon be necessary for some benevolent educationist to open schools for dunces."[107] Moreover, neglected students were not always those of the weakest intelligence, as frequently children of the most socio-economically deprived backgrounds, who found little reinforcement in their family life and were all too often distinguished by a lack of regularity in school attendance, received the least attention from teachers.

The anxiety, mentioned earlier as being manifest in the teachers, was frequently reflected in the pupils. There were many reports of children frightened out of their wits on examination day, perhaps because of threats from teachers to do well or maybe because the enormity of the occasion was just too much for them. Joseph Ashby of Tysoe in Warwickshire related, years after, the effect of the inspector's visit to the village school:

> The master's anxiety was deep for his earnings depended on the children's work. One year the atmosphere so affected the lower standards that, one after another as they were brought to the inspector, the boys howled and the girls whimpered. It took hours to get through them.[108]

Sometimes, even the better scholars, out of timidity or fear, just stood dumb before the strange inquisitor and refused to answer any question. They, of course, had to be rejected, the teacher thereby losing a valuable part of his income. Still, it was also denied that children were often frightened on examination day. Inspector Oakeley, in 1873, declared that, in his ten years' experience, pupils only seldom displayed fright when under examination and such nervousness was invariably due to poor teaching and discipline.[109] Indeed, Inspector Wilde stated that any anxiety displayed by children on examination day was generally because of a great eagerness to be present at the inspection.

Many were the reasons why children failed to be present on the day of the examination ranging from necessity to work to supplement the family income, especially at seasonal labor, to not having new clothes to wear in honor of such an auspicious day.[110] Harsh weather was also a frequent cause of low attendance[111] as was sickness, particularly when an epidemic ravaged a school district. The Rev. John Acton of Iwerne Minster wrote to Inspector Tregarthen in 1868:

> I fear we shall have a sorry number to present to you, not much above 40. Mumps visited nearly every house in the spring, sadly reducing our average, and now for the last month almost every child has been "acorning." But when by this means the children are able to add 4s. or 5s. a week to the miserable earnings of our poor laborers, what can we say?[112]

Mary Sturt quotes from the log-book of the school in Llanfairfechan in Caernarvonshire which she declares pinpoints "the heart of the problem":

> July 6. Got the Log Book. Attendance small. Hay harvest commanding attention. July 7. Field labor making wide gaps today. 8th. Bilberry-gathering season sets in sweeping many away. 9th. Donkey riding getting very fashionable. Boys leave school to attend to the ladies. Learning English so.[113]

Naturally, it was very difficult for either the school authorities or H.M.I.'s to plan for such happenings. The inspector's schedule was generally planned months in advance and it was never easy for him to change the dates of his school visits. In the absence of modern communication systems, it was invariably the case that the inspector first heard of a prevailing epidemic when he actually arrived in the school district, by which time it was too late to cancel the examination. The most common epidemics were those of small-pox, whooping-cough, scarlatina, and measles; and, where they raged, the grant for that year was inevitably low. And because of the resultant lack of finance to pay the teacher, buy books, equipment and so on, it was almost as inevitable that the number of passes and the grant for the following year would also be low. It was usually very difficult for a school to recover from a year's small grant. Moreover, some districts, especially the poorer ones, were particularly susceptible to illnesses. The newer towns and villages in the mining districts, often without drainage and other sanitary conveniences, suffered particularly severely from epidemics. Merthyr Tydfil, for instance, was reported to have had "an alarming rate of mortality."[114]

Because the need for the government grant was so important to the manager, the teacher, and the welfare of the school, pressure was often put on parents to make sure that even very sick children were present on the inspection day: "To hear paroxysms of whooping cough, to observe the pustules of small-pox, to see infants carefully wrapped up and held in

their mothers' arms or seated on a stool by the fire because too ill to take their proper places, are events not so rare in an inspector's experience as they ought to be. The risk of the infant's life and the danger of infection to others are preferred to the forfeiture of a grant of 6s. 6d."[115]

Nevertheless, it must be stated that in many cases payment by results was responsible for improved attendance by children who had been accustomed to being rather cavalier in their attitude towards coming to school. In fact, Inspector Binns could observe in 1867, "Teachers now make it a practice both to send after absentee scholars, and to call upon their parents, with a view to remove the evils arising out of irregularity, and to induce them to take a greater interest in their children's improvement."[116] Still, it is probable that the teachers' motivation was sometimes more financial than pedagogical.

While sickness and employment accounted for many children being absent from school on the day of inspection, it is also clear that sometimes pupils qualified by the requisite number of days in attendance were kept back by their teachers and school managers from examination.[117] It was even alleged that slower children were occasionally told in person or through their parents to stay away from school on the inspection day.[118] As Inspector Alderson pointed out, this failure to present pupils was generally due to the interpretation of the fifth supplementary rule, namely that the authorities "need not present all the scholars who in each class are qualified for examination by number of attendances." However, interpretations differed widely from school to school, with one institution presenting all its qualified pupils, while another only those who were likely to perform creditably and gain the grant. Consequently, in a situation where different schools often varied greatly in the quality of candidates presented, it was clearly impossible to provide a meaningful comparison of results. "The percentage of success may be the same in each, and may indicate, nevertheless, two very different degrees of efficiency, or the worse school may actually be made to appear the better."[119] Thus, it was exceedingly difficult for parents to gauge the true condition of a school. For the relative merits of different schools based on examination results could only be judged when the number of pupils actually presented for examination was compared to the number qualified by attendance.[120] It is clear, at any rate, that after the regulation of 1875, which compelled every child qualified by attendance to be presented for examination, the percentage of passes tended to be lowered.[121]

It was often suggested that the selection of only those children for examination who were likely to pass well was against the whole spirit of the examination. Indeed, in 1873, Inspector Stokes observed that the examination "is held specially in the interest of dull and backward children and its object is frustrated when only the clever and intelligent are put forward."[122] Four years later, Inspector Kennedy suggested that a qualified pupil who was absent and who failed to provide an adequate reason for his absence should be marked as a failure: "If this were done, the teachers might be expected to try to secure the presence of every scholar, even of the most backward, in the hope that he might pass in at least one of the three R's."[123] Furthermore, it was soon realized that many managers and teachers were refusing to present students at the standard appropriate for their attainments and intellectual abilities, the rationale being to ensure that they were kept the longest time in the school and to secure as many grants as possible.[124] Such retardation, it was argued, resulted in injurious effects on the educational progress of the individual child and in necessarily being harmful to the well-being of the school itself.[125] However, such a situation was understandable, if not excusable, for teachers had little financial incentive to present pupils at the upper levels: the grant was the same as at the lower, while the chances of failing were correspondingly higher. This was especially lamentable as the examinations, particularly at the lower standards, were usually not very rigorous and it would not have been beyond the capability of many students to go through the work of two or more standards in one year under the guidance of a good teacher. However, through fear of losing money, this was frequently not permitted, thereby doing clever pupils "irreparable harm, and inducing discerning parents to remove them from school at an

earlier age than they otherwise would."[126] As a result, some inspectors bemoaned the fact that classification of students by age was not employed (as Robert Lowe himself had initially proposed), arguing that despite the hardships that it might entail such a system would be more equitable and educationally sound.[127] It is true that quite a different criticism of the system of payment by results was also proffered concerning the rule that children who failed in one standard must, nevertheless, be offered for examination in a higher standard the next time. For, as Inspector Kennedy objected, if a pupil had for some reason been placed in too high a standard at first and failed in it, he would still be "obliged to be examined year by year in an ever rising standard . . . never [having] a chance of being duly grounded and acquitting [himself] with credit."[128]

Pedagogy and Curriculum

As we have seen, under a system where teachers' income frequently depended on the success of the pupils in the annual examination, it was to be expected that they made especially assiduous efforts to get as many of the children as possible to pass. Again, managers naturally desired the largest grant possible. However, such eagerness to secure a good numerical result was frequently complemented by decreased attention to the question of whether or not true education was being benefited. "Enthusiasm for results got anyhow was to replace enthusiasm for education, for improving methods, for alertness to make the school work meaningful."[129] It was not with tongue in cheek that R. H. Quick declared that if Pestalozzi had been teaching in England "no doubt his work would have been pronounced a terrible failure by the Joint Board or by H. M. Inspectors. He would not have passed 50 per cent and his Managers would have dismissed him for earning so poor a grant. But, if left to himself, he would have turned out men and women capable of thinking clearly, of feeling rightly, and of reverencing all that is worthy of reverence. These are extra subjects not at present included in our curriculum."[130]

Sadly, complementing the cramming pedagogy, rough methods were sometimes employed in the eagerness to secure as many passes as possible. The substance of the evidence of a female assistant teacher to an inquiry by the London School Board would undoubtedly have been echoed by others:

Q. Would there be children in those days in that infant's school who, because of the neglect of their early education, and because of the fact that they had only just been admitted to your school, could not possibly pass standard one at seven years of age?
A. They did. We made them, they had to.

Q. Do you care to describe to the committee the methods by which you made them?
A. That is the reason I did not wish to continue in an elementary school. I could not continue such methods.

Q. What were they?
A. Coercion--driving. I used to keep the children in till one o'clock nearly every day--little children who had not enough to eat, or any wholesome blood in their bodies, so that their brain could work, day after day--day after day. And I used to stand over them until they did read.

Q. You ultimately got them to pass?
A. Yes.[131]

A. J. Swinburne, long an inspector, mentions in his memoirs that some teachers clearly believed in the efficacy of corporal punishment for gaining results:

> And there were others, whose descriptions of their treatment by love so delighted me as I strode along the front rows that I raised my hand in wonder--only to find a dozen boys or girls (alas, it was more than once) cower as expectant of a blow! A lady once told me they find out, in America, good keepers of horses, cows, or chickens in this way.[132]

In 1964, at the age of 92, Charles Cooper, writing about his school days during the 1870s and 1880s at Walton National School in Yorkshire, had not allowed the years to dim his memories of the harshness of the payment by results regime: "It was a cruel system. The cane was used freely for both boys and girls. Children were not regarded as mentally deficient. The idea was that every child could do the work if he tried hard enough. And he was made to try by threat of punishment."[133] It should be remembered, however, that this was the nineteenth century when typical pedagogical methods and attitudes towards children were much sterner than they are today. Moreover, physical punishment was by no means confined to working class schools, as is clear from even a cursory acquaintance with the public schools of the socioeconomic elite.

Allied to the numerous complaints concerning the mechanical nature of teaching during the era of payment by results were corresponding criticisms about the debasing of the curriculum. All too often, what would pay was, most assumed, of over-riding importance, while what hindered the gaining of the grant was to be neglected. Generally, the prime consideration of teachers was to aim at that little which was anticipated to satisfy the inspector.[134] As a result, "Her Majesty's inspector felt himself to be little more than a mechanical index of proficiency in the 3 R's."[135] During the first years of payment by results, only the three R's were eligible for grants; accordingly, for the most part, only the three R's, together with religious knowledge which was compulsory, were taught. The teacher, wrote Inspector Alderson, "thinks he has done quite enough when he offers the State its pound of flesh in the shape of so much reading, writing, and ciphering. Thus, the unpaid subjects will never compete with the paid subjects."[136] Though the promulgators of the Code insisted that they had merely intended to establish an essential minimum which all elementary school children were to attain with no desire to limit the subjects taught to this minimum, it was frequently the practical result that the basic subjects prescribed by the Education Department for the grant were regarded as the maximum to be aimed at.[137] As Thomas Huxley observed in his Science and Education, in 1893: "the Revised Code did not compel any schoolmaster to leave off teaching anything; but, by the very simple process of refusing to pay for many kinds of teaching, it has practically put an end to them."[138] In fact, Inspector Nutt reported, in 1864, that with the almost total demise of grammar, geography, and history, the only subject remaining by which an inspector could test the children's intelligence was religious knowledge.[139]

There were occasional reports that the three R's were better taught than formerly, Dr. Morell stating in 1864, that "there can be no doubt whatever that the reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling of our primary inspected schools, are now more perfect that they have ever been since such schools were in existence amongst us."[140] In 1869, Inspector Kennedy remarked on the increased accuracy in the three R's, asserting his belief "that the Revised Code has been partly instrumental in bringing about this desirable result."[141] Nevertheless, it would be naive to imagine that, even with their increased emphasis, the three elementary subjects were consistently taught well under payment by results. On the other hand, it is moot whether or not the new system introduced a dramatic deterioration in their teaching. Even before the Revised Code, the three R's had frequently been taught in a mechanical fashion and, for the most part, they continued to be so taught after 1862. In such cases, the main emphasis was on mere factual matters with little attention being paid to their contribution to a good general education.[142] Memory, for example, was usually stressed at the expense of understanding, with many pupils being drilled "into performing certain exercises with parrot-like

facility."[143] In reading, while the child was often possessed of "a mechanical readiness of utterance" which would enable him to secure a pass, he frequently had little notion of what the passage being read meant.[144]

For years after the introduction of payment by results, the annual examination in reading had to be from some book used in that particular school; that is, the inspector could not examine from a book of his own choice. Accordingly, it was common practice for the teacher to choose a short book with easy words and, for the twelve months before the inspection day, to drill each page into the pupils until most of them had learned the whole work by heart.[145] In 1884, Inspector Blakiston declared that a Board School Inspector found in an infant school that the pupils could continue anywhere in the book with not even a glance at the page.[146] In like manner, Inspector Temple reported that it is "very amusing to watch the look of blank dismay which comes over a teacher's face when I tell some fluent urchin to shut his book and go on with his lesson by rote, and the scholar, proud of his accomplishment, obeys me."[147] To counteract this memorization, some inspectors even asked pupils to read backwards.[148] Of course, the primary reason for this abysmal practice of memorizing the book was that it facilitated the securing of a good grant: "It *pays*, even in the hands of an inexperienced teacher, when the aim is to make the class *get up* a reading book. This is too often the one aim and object."[149]

Plenteous complaints were lodged regarding the inadequate and mechanical teaching of arithmetic.[150] Again, it was a common criticism that, too often, the major concern of the manager and teacher was financial, namely having as many pupils as possible pass the narrowly prescribed syllabus, and that everything which did not conduce to this goal was to be ignored. As Inspector Robinson observed: "a slight deviation from the beaten track causes instant consternation."[151] Inspector Routledge related the dismay occasioned when, in dictating the figures 1,714, he used the terminology "seventeen hundred and fourteen," instead of "one thousand seven hundred and fourteen," the latter being the method employed by the previous Inspector.[152]

Though, in 1869, Inspector Brodie could assert that "having examined schools in the primeval period before the Code, and also since, I wish to say that the result of my experience is that the Revised Code has in no way discouraged higher teaching," evidence is abundant that the higher subjects did in fact receive less attention.[153] The manifest reason is that they did not pay.[154] Many other teachers would have empathized with the log book entry of North Street Wesleyan School, Bristol for 21 April 1871:

> Believing that one-fourth of the school time that was devoted to subjects not recognized by Government, and consequently, not paid for by grants, had the effect of keeping a well-informed school, but of causing the percentage results to be lower than those of the schools that are mechanical in their working and unintelligible in their tone; I have been compelled against my inclination to arrange that less time be devoted to them in future, and more time to those that pay best.[155]

Even where such subjects as grammar, geography, or history continued to be taught, they were generally set aside for the two or three months prior to the inspector's visit, in order that full time might be devoted to the subjects which would be examined.[156] This decline in the higher subjects frequently heralded a dramatic change from the pre-1862 situation. Inspector Bowstead, in 1866, spoke of that large number of intermediate type schools, i.e., those neither of the first nor of the lowest rank, which besides teaching the three basic subjects in previous years, "also cultivated the intelligence of the children" by teaching the higher subjects. He acknowledged that in the old days, when the Government paid directly for the pupil-teachers, the regular teachers had more time for the extra subjects. But, now, with a great reduction in assistant teachers due to the schools being obliged to pay for them out of their own funds, the

staff generally did not exist for a broad range of subjects. He concluded that while "it may be that the reading, writing, and ciphering in such schools are better, on the whole, than they used to be, [I am] persuaded that this gain, if gain there be, is more than balanced by the loss in another direction."[157] It was also argued that teachers frequently ignored the extra subjects because they realized that there was generally hardly any time on the inspection day for the H.M.I., if he did not have an assistant, to examine in these subjects. Under the old Code, however, there was usually much more time for testing subjects other than the three R's and for examining processes as opposed to mere results. More attention was then paid by the inspector to the school premises, equipment, books, methods of teaching, financial arrangements and so on. There was generally a class examination in which the pupils, as a group, were assessed, as opposed to the testing of each individual child.[158]

Some H.M.I.'s were not particularly upset about the falling off in the higher subjects, arguing that when excessive attention was paid to them the three R's might be adversely affected. D. R. Fearon wrote in his 1876 work, School Inspector, that many schools

> –those, for example, in rural districts, or those amid a very poor and fluctuating population–could not really do justice to the elementary subjects, and at the same time teach such subjects as geography, grammar, and history. And in so far as the Revised Code forced such schools to give up their more tempting and showy work, and to apply themselves to the drudgery of the essentials, it did good service.[159]

It was also pointed out that a pupil who failed his examination in the three R's in one standard would have his work cut out to pass these subjects at a higher standard the following year (he was not allowed be presented twice in the same standard), never mind passing in a higher subject. "To try to make such boys pass in geography or grammar also, is to imitate the dog in the fable who lost the substance by grasping at the shadow."[160] Nevertheless, numerous inspectors were adversely critical of the decline in subjects other than the three R's. For example, in 1867, Mr. Alderson, though acknowledging that there appeared to be evidence of a revival of geography in his school district, believed that it resembled arithmetic in that its teaching was far too mechanical, with children learning lists of stereotypical answers to stock questions.[161]

It is informative to read the 1878 report of the distinguished H.M.I., Joshua Fitch. He relates that he had only recently examined Standard I in a Board School where the sheer mechanical accuracy of the answering could hardly be faulted. However, when he asked the teacher what collective lessons had been provided and how he had the pupils really think about and understand what was being taught, the teacher replied that there was no time for such oral discussion and that "all his time was taken up in fulfilling the precise requirements of the Code." Fitch told also of another school where, having asked the girls during an examination in geography what was the language spoken in Australia, the mistress immediately objected that it was unfair to include such a question in a geography examination. In yet another school, Fitch states that out of 60 pupils presented to recite the opening 100 lines of the poem "The Prisoner of Chillon" only six had read the rest of this short poem or had been told the end of the story.[162] Numerous H.M.I.'s told similar stories. For, under the regime of payment by results there was a pervasive temptation to stress only the bare bones of the set curriculum–in prescribing the point below which grants would not be paid the Education Department had "determined the point beyond which instruction need not go."[163]

After the Education Department issued the Minute of 20 February 1867, many schools did begin teaching another subject, usually geography or grammar, the former reason that there was no time to teach them being conveniently forgotten now that there was the lure of a money

payment.[164] While some inspectors welcomed this new rule, Matthew Arnold, for one, did not, maintaining that mechanical examination whether in higher subjects or the three R's was totally anathema as far as true education was concerned:

> More free play for the inspector, and more free play, in consequence, for the teacher, is what is wanted; and the Minute of February with its elaborate mechanism of the one-fifth and the three-fourths makes the new examination as formal and lifeless as the old one. In the game of mechanical contrivances the teachers will in the end beat us; and as it is now found possible, by ingenious preparation, to get children through the Revised Code examination in reading, writing, and ciphering, without their really knowing how to read, write, or cipher, so it will with practice no doubt be found possible to get the three-fourths of the one-fifth of the children over six through the examination in grammar, geography, and history, without their really knowing any one of these three matters.[165]

It is clear that, more often than not, the higher subjects were not taught very well, as was the case with reading, writing, and arithmetic. Nevertheless, though the three R's remained the bread and butter of a school's grant, as changes were made to successive Codes the prominence given to the higher subjects increased.[166] But, again, the chief rationale for teaching the latter was usually financial rather than truly educational. It is interesting to read an 1878 letter of Robert Lowe to Lord George Hamilton, one of his successors as Vice-President of the Committee of Council, in which he criticized the examination of subjects other than the three R's:

> What happened was this: when I was at the Education Department, as my eyes hurt me a good deal, whenever I went into the country I used to send to the national school to ask them to let me have one or two boys and girls who could read well, and they were to come up to me and read in the evening. I found that few, if any, of these boys and girls could really read. They got over words of three syllables but five syllables completely stumped them. I therefore came to the conclusion that, as regards reading, writing and arithmetic, which are three subjects which can be definitely tested, each child should either read or write a passage, or do some simple sum of arithmetic, and the idiots who succeeded me have piled up on the top of the three R's a mass of class and specific subjects which they propose to test in the same way.[167]

Robert Lowe is sometimes uncritically depicted by commentators antagonistic to payment by results as the arch villain behind all aspects of the system, but, as the above reveals, care should be taken not to assign to him particulars which postdated him and which he himself might not have approved.

The Examination Process

Most Victorians implicitly believed in the efficacy of examinations and would have found little to criticize in H. Holman's 1898 declaration that "education without results, which can be tested by a reasonably-conducted examination, is a contradiction in terms."[168] However, many H.M.I.'s, the individuals who had actually to administer the examinations, cast a jaundiced eye at the process. While Matthew Arnold immediately springs to mind in this connection, other inspectors also were doubtful about assessing education by tests.[169] For example, Mr. Stewart remarked, in 1854:

> My own experience of school work leads me to think that it is scarcely possible to devise any form of limited examination of individual children which will test all the really important points which a good teacher has in view, and on which the efficiency of every school more or less depends.[170]

Similarly, Mr. Campbell was contemptuous of the notion that the mere percentage of examination passes was a worthwhile test of a school's efficiency, arguing that such factors as the overall discipline and tone, how children relate to each other in class, the morality in the playground, the relation between the head teacher and his assistants, the accuracy and regularity with which all school records are maintained should also be assessed.[171] It was also contended that examinations were fallible, Inspector Harrison declaring, in 1881, that the element of luck is ever present in any test. Moreover, some schools, he added, just happen to have more dull or clever pupils than others. Again, a teacher may fall sick at a critical period and so jeopardize his pupils' chances. In addition, some of the brightest children may be absent for some reason or other. Also, a holiday just before the examination could have an unsettling effect, as indeed might the occasion of bad weather on the day of the examination. Certainly, Harrison concluded, the mere percentage of passes was by no means always the most reliable arbiter of a school's true worth.[172] Still, there was never any chance that the examination system would be eliminated, despite all the various arguments against their efficacy and despite the manifest nervousness which they occasioned in children. However, some argued that what was needed was to make the process less formidable. For instance, in 1866, Inspector Parez, sensibly suggested that managers should arrange for mock examinations to be held periodically before the real day of inspection and conducted by some neighboring clergyman or someone else unknown to the children: "If this plan be adopted, the shyness of the children will soon wear off."[173] In fact, many schools did hold mock examinations and, presumably, they did help to accustom children somewhat to the rigors of the real test.

It was often argued that an important benefit of payment by results was its standardization of the testing process. For example, Inspector Bowstead, though acknowledging that it was "very laborious," was happy that the new system of examination had eliminated much uncertainty from the inspector's job:

> Under the Old Code there was a certain vagueness about the duties which he had to perform, and a great difficulty in satisfying his own mind that he had arrived at a true conclusion. Now he has a definite task before him, he knows exactly how that task is to be accomplished, and he feels, when it is done, that there can be no mistake about the official interpretation of its results.[174]

Similarly, Inspector Barry saw it as an improvement that "the inspector has a definite standard by which to judge of results in each school."[175] Nevertheless, there was often a distinct lack of uniformity in examining. Some inspectors were stricter than others and failed children who might have passed in another district.[176] It was even said that some teachers, when seeking a position, calculated the percentage of passes in different school districts and were influenced by the scores in making their employment decision.[177] Again, though most of the H.M.I.'s were honorable and capable men, some were ill-suited to the job, having little inkling of child psychology and pedagogy. A few were detested by teachers for their sadistic delight in humiliating children, for asking them incomprehensible contextual questions totally above their age level, and for their linguistically tricky dictation passages.[178] James Runciman, a spokesman for teachers' rights, in his 1887 Schools and Scholars, was particularly acerbic in his criticism of certain inspectors:

> . . . at present I can only declare that, sooner than teach in an elementary school, under any one of some score of inspectors whom I could name, I would go before the mast in a collier, or break stones in a casual ward–or, better than all,

die. An inspector need not have any brains, but he is autocratic, whatever his disposition and ability may be, and, if he is stupid or malignant, he may make life a perfect hell for the scholastic drudges in his district.[179]

The variation in the expectations and manner of H.M.I.'s inevitably led to anxiety and resentment among school managers and teachers. Some teachers became cunning, suiting their teaching to the ways of an accustomed inspector, a ploy which sometimes resulted in panic when a different one arrived and conducted the examination according to a different method. The subjective element in determining pass or fail was probably more evident in reading than in writing or arithmetic, spelling and sums being either right or wrong. The lack of uniformity in assessing reading was often due to the great variation in difficulty of the reading books used in the same standard in different schools. Inspector Pennethorne observed that 3rd Standard books in one school were no more difficult than 1st Standard books in another, advising, therefore, "that if an authorized series were published under the sanction of the Education Department, we should be sure of obtaining carefully compiled and instructive books, and it would be far more easy accurately to decide on passes and failures."[180]

Before the introduction of the merit grant, there were no variations in the money given to reward levels of answering. A particularly good performance by a pupil or a class received no bonus; a bare pass was accounted the same as a distinguished one. It was often argued that such a system failed to engender a striving to achieve excellence and that many teachers were tempted just to aim for the lowest common denominator. Understandably, change was frequently advocated, specifically, to institute different levels of grants to correspond to variations in the scale of merit in answering. It was argued that proposals to implement a scale of grants for different examination results were thoroughly in line with the principle of payment by results. But it was to be twenty years after the introduction of payment by results that the merit grant was instituted. However, then the criticism was frequently voiced that, complementing the lack of uniformity in assessing the three R's, there was sometimes a great disparity in awarding the merit grant. In fact, one inspector during the Cross Commission complained that all the merit grant accomplished was "to reward the rich and favored schools and to punish the small poor schools."[181]

The propensity of schoolchildren, some might say the natural propensity, to copy during tests, was certainly not dampened during the period of payment by results. In fact, it was probably exacerbated due to the eagerness of pupils to pass or, perhaps, their fear of failing. As extenuating circumstances, it might be remarked, that schools were often small and crowded, with children seated almost on top of each other. In such cases it would have been very difficult for pupils not to see what was written on their neighbors' slate or page. Also, it is likely that in some schools where copying was very extensive on the examination day such "mutual helping" was not excessively discouraged by teachers throughout the rest of the year. On the contrary, it may even have been considered pedagogically useful, owing something perhaps to the former widespread monitorial system.

However, ploys to fool the inspector were not confined to the pupils, for there were frequent complaints that teachers sometimes endeavored to obtain copies of the arithmetic questions set by the H.M.I.s in other schools and then drilled their pupils in them in the hope that the same or similar questions would be asked in their own schools. F. H. Spencer relates that when he was a teacher he and his colleagues used to copy down the arithmetic questions from the inspector's cards and to forward them

> to friends in other schools not yet examined in order that they might put in some quite useful practice. This was quite fair, so it appeared to us. Towards our colleagues in other schools it was, indeed, chivalrous, for it gave them a chance of

> outdoing us; towards the inspectors we also considered it to be cricket: they were our examiners, and it was lawful to outwit them, if we could, by any device not plainly in the nature of a verbal lie.[182]

However such a practice was viewed by some inspectors as cheating. Mr. Steele remarked that a teacher's acting in such a fashion "is guilty of a fraudulent design; and if his design succeeds, he is obtaining money and credit on false pretenses." Steele, accordingly, recommended that sums be changed very frequently.[183]

Conclusions

By the final years of the nineteenth century, little remained of Lowe's 1862 Revised Code and payment by results was no more. In the foregoing pages, the interpretation proffered of this system of educational accountability has definitely tended towards the adversely critical. The author contends that it was a system essentially anti-educational, illiberal, aiming at social control; and one which, for the most part, remained, throughout its thirty-five year reign, true to its mean-spirited, expediency-stressing beginnings. However, payment by results has not been seen by everyone in a pejorative light. In its own day, a number of modern revisionist critics, if not lavish in their praise, have at least stressed that some aspects of the system were beneficial in their effects.

As we have seen, the new educational system, introduced in 1862, was frequently lauded by H.M.I.'s, sometimes quite fulsomely. In 1869, Inspector Temple was unequivocal:

> The Revised Code has done unmixed good, and every additional year convinces me more and more of the wisdom of its framers, and makes me more determined to protest and fight against any misrepresentation or misconception of it, whether ignorant or willful. Education before the Revised Code was showy, flashy, and unsubstantial; it had no backbone; it was like the pulpy creatures which, according to Dr. Whewell, may exist in the planet Jupiter.[184]

A year earlier, Inspector Watts, though admitting that the pupil-teacher system had been severely damaged by the Revised Code, concluded:

> that the results it has produced are far in excess of those produced under the old system; that dull children are no longer in danger of being neglected; that it is doubly the interest of teachers to cultivate a wholesome acquaintance with the parents of the children in their charge; and that the prediction of its author has been fully realized, that if it would entail greater expense, it would at least secure greater results.[185]

In an age suffused with the spirit of Utilitarianism, Inspector Byrne's 1866 comment would have engendered favorable echoes: "The principle of payment by results is not only sound in theory, but has approved itself in practice as easy of application as it is beneficent in its effects."[186] Just after the end of payment by results in 1898, H. Holman viewed the preceding era in its own terms rather than from a later period's superior sensibility:

> Within the limits set by the code, and by the ideal which most people then had of education for the poor, viz. an elementary knowledge of the three R's, Mr. Lowe had more than redeemed his promises, for the work was, as compared with that previously done, both more effective and cheaper by nearly half a million pounds. The author of the revised code is far too often exclusively reviled by critics as the author of payment by results, and no regard is paid to the fact that he certainly made the best of a bad business. . . . The results which he demanded and

> obtained were at any rate better than the absence of results in respect of three-fourths of the pupils, as had been previously the case. If for nothing else, Mr. Lowe deserves our thanks for having perpetrated a blunder, which has been one more step to our blundering out of blunders.[187]

In like manner, D. W. Sylvester, in his 1974 work on Robert Lowe, insists on the necessity of studying the Revised Code and payment by results in the context of the second half of nineteenth century Britain rather than that of a century later when the whole social, economic, political, and, of course, educational climate is so different. Considered in its own historical context, declares Sylvester, Lowe's system, though by no means all good, was certainly not worthy of condemnation on all sides either.[188] Similarly, John Hurt argues that a study of payment by results in the context of its own time reveals the difficulty of seeing "how the administrative problems of the day could have been solved except by the introduction of some form of objective test. In the state's struggle for control over public education, the imposition of a predominantly secular syllabus, in 1862, was an important prelude to the breaking, eight years later, of the monopoly previously enjoyed by the religious societies."[189]

Yet, acknowledging the general backwardness of the infrastructure of Britain's education in the post-1862 era, the mistake of failing to treat historical topics according to the terms of their context, and also the fact, as Hurt points out, that no "golden age of school teaching" existed before payment by results, there is still no obligation to accept that the new system was inevitable and that it was, in fact, of considerable benefit to the pupils. For it was bad, frequently horrendously so; the sad thing was that a better system, with a little foresight and daring, could have been implemented. Certainly, the great Victorian sage, Matthew Arnold, was adamant that the educational system was so appalling that it could only be improved. Arnold, thirty-five years an H.M.I. and one who probably knew more about his nation's schools than the vast majority of his compatriots, over and over reiterated that England's malaise was primarily due to the inadequacies of the educational structure, payment by results coming in for particularly harsh criticism. He insisted on the necessity of doing away with the mechanical nature of the system, of broadening the curriculum so that pupils might be imbued with that foundation so essential for the growth of his desired "culture," of treating children in a more humane fashion, of improving the training and remuneration of teachers, of substituting true education for the mere "machinery" of education, of eradicating the pervasive Victorian notion that economics, value for money, and education were inextricably intermingled. He repeatedly advised that much could be learned from Continental educational systems which were far more enlightened than those existing in England and which, furthermore, did not employ the system of payment by results.

Nor was Arnold alone in his antagonism to the domestic educational iniquities and his advocacy that far reaching changes were urgently required, especially the abandonment of payment by results. Many others–teachers, educational theorists, social critics, intellectuals, spokesmen for the working classes–were vociferous in their condemnation of the mechanical, routine, anti-educational, and thoroughly impersonal nature of this system, as becomes very clear from a reading of the voluminous evidence presented to the Cross Commission which reported in 1888. Moreover, the teachings of Pestalozzi, Herbart, Froebel were becoming increasingly known in England, perhaps the main ingredient of which was the insistence on treating children as individual persons requiring love, understanding, and respect, a notion far removed from the prevailing treatment of children as essentially grant earning entities. But it seems that the Education Department, in the 1860s and 1870s especially, had little inkling of such educational theorists with their child-centered approach to education. The bureaucrats who implemented and maintained payment by results for all these years just did not know very much about children and pedagogical theories. Nevertheless, knowledge of child psychology and pedagogical advances was available and could have been consulted to the great benefit of the nation's education. On the contrary, however, children were invariably seen in terms of

money, the personnel in the Education Department consistently failing to recognize "the sheer futility of attempting to regulate education by economic laws."[190] But none of this was inevitable. If the civil servants and politicians had paid more attention to advances in educational and psychological theories and had opened their eyes more to what was happening on the Continent, elementary education might very well have proceeded along far different lines in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Payment by results is also to be condemned for its rigid association with social control. Particularly in the earlier years of the system, those wielding educational power treated the children of the poor and workers as being necessarily and rightfully confined within the limits of their subservient social class. Brian Simon quotes Tawney's view, expressed in 1924: "the elementary schools of 1870 were intended in the main to produce an orderly, civil, obedient population, with sufficient education to understand a command."[191] Payment by results was a constituent part of an undoubtedly reactionary policy which provided an inferior education to working class children, one of its principal aims being to strengthen social control and to hinder upward mobility. For the most part, the three R's were considered sufficient for such pupils. What use were higher subjects for children who would inevitably become agricultural laborers, inland navigators, or unskilled factory workers at the age of eleven or twelve? In fact, advanced knowledge might be distinctly dangerous in the wrong hands. Even when "specific" and "class" subjects were offered, they were more often than not considered as frills and, in very practical terms, never worth very much for grant purposes. Though the latter were distinctly more popular than the former, they were all consistently viewed as secondary to the basic subjects and, as Selleck declares, throughout the whole era the very nature of the grant system "ensured that when the teacher looked to the grant-bearing potential of the curriculum it was on the Three R's that his eye first fell."[192]

In fine, payment by results was a narrow, restrictive, Philistine system of educational accountability which impeded for the second half of the nineteenth century any hope that England's elementary education might swiftly advance from its generally appalling condition during the first half of the century when the theories and practices scorned in the likes of Dickens' Hard Times were more the norm than the exception. If there is a lesson to be learned from this dismal episode in England's educational history, perhaps it is that true accountability in education should not be facilely linked to mechanical examination results, for the pedagogical methods employed to attain those results will themselves be surely mechanical and the education of the children will be so much the worse.

REFERENCES

1. Ivor Morrish, Education Since 1800 (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970), p. 11.

2. James Murphy, Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971), p. 17.

3. T. L. Jarman, Landmarks in the History of Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1952), p. 281.

4. H. C. Barnard, A History of English Education From 1760 (London: University of London Press, 1964), p. 99.

5. P. W. Musgrave, Society and Education in England Since 1800 (London: Methuen, 1968), p. 21.

6. For the Concordat see J. Stuart Maclure, Educational Documents: England and Wales, 1816-1968 (London: Chapman and Hall, 968), pp. 46-47.

7. Murphy, Church, State and Schools, p. 22. 8. Jarman, Landmarks, p. 260.

9. See Maclure, Educational Documents, pp. 52-55.

10. See "Newcastle Commission, 1861," British Parliamentary Papers, Education General (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970), vol. 3, p. 315.

11. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 24.

12. S. J. Curtis, History of Education in Great Britain (London: University Tutorial Press, 1963), p. 249.

13. Barnard, History of English Education, pp. 105-108. A major development occurred in 1856 when due to the increasing complexity of administering the annual educational grants an Education Department was established thereby absorbing the Committee of Council for Education. However, no one was made Minister, the position of Minister of Education having to wait until this century to be created.

14. E. G. West, Education and the Industrial Revolution (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1975), pp. 106-107; David Wardle, English Popular Education 1780-1975 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 35; Peter Gordon and Denis Lawton, Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978), p. 182.

15. D. W. Sylvester, Robert Lowe and Education (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp. 44-46; Donald Mason, "Pesitte Opinion and the Genesis of Payment by Results: the True Story of the Newcastle Commission," *History of Education* 17, no. 4 (1988):277-279.

16. "Newcastle Commission," vol. 3, p. 87.

17. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 188. 18. Ibid., vol. 3, pp. 243.

19. Gordon and Lawton, Curriculum Change, p. 12.

20. "Newcastle Commission," vol. 3, p. 168; also p. 273. 21. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 157.

22. Musgrave, Society and Education, p. 35.

23. Isaac Sharpless, English Education in the Elementary and Secondary Schools (New York: Appleton, 1897), p. 30.

24. See Sylvester, Robert Lowe, pp. 46-57.

25. "Newcastle Commission," vol. 3, pp. 188-189; see also p. 225.

26. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 199. 27. Hansard, Third Series, 164, col. 724. 28. Ibid, col.726.

29. For the authorship of the Revised Code see Ralph Lingen's evidence, particularly questions 369-384, before the Select Committee on Education of 1865-1866. [Quoted in Michael Hyndman, Schools and Schooling in England and Wales: A Documentary History (London: Harper and Rowe, 1978), pp. 203-204]

30. See "Minute of the Right Honourable The Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education Establishing a Revised Code of Regulations. 29 July, 1861." British Sessional Papers, House of Commons, (London: HMSO, 1862), vol. LXI, p. 117, par. 2.

31. See Ibid., pp. 125 and 126, pars. 41, 46, and 47. 32. Hansard, Third Series, 164, col. 734-735.

33. "Minute, 29 July, 1861," p. 125, pars. 43 and 41 (d). 34. Hansard, Third Series, 164, col. 736.

35. Marcham declares that "the evidence that he cared more for saving money than for setting standards is formidable." [A. J. Marcham, "Recent Interpretations of the Revised Code of Education, 1862," *History of Education* 8, no. 2 (1979):132] Selleck quotes from a pamphlet of the Congregational Board of Education to show that Lowe was not alone in his advocacy of "free trade" in education: "If the open competition of the market secure the best and cheapest article, why should not the quality of education benefit by competition? . . . I say, then, that on these, the lowest grounds, it might be maintained that there is nothing in education and the machinery for promoting it, which removes it from the operation of those politico-economical laws that regulate industry and the provision for our material wants." [R. J. W. Selleck, *The New Education* (London: Pitman, 1968), p. 16]

36. "Copies of all Memorials and Letters which have been addressed to the Lord President of the Council or to the Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education, on the Subject of the Revised Code, by the Authorities of any Educational Society, Board, or Committee, or of any Training School." British Sessional Papers, House of Commons, 1862, vol. XLI.

37. James Kay Shuttleworth, "Letter to Lord Granville," 4 November, 1861, Ibid., p. 407. Lowe's advocacy of the economic benefit of the Code was also attacked in the London Quarterly Review: "It is a low-bred, short-sighted, fallacious economy, penny-wise and pound-foolish, altogether unworthy of statesmen and philanthropists; and the educational results sought to be secured by the new regulations are not such as touch the centre of the child's nature, and reach the springs of moral feeling and true intelligence, but are merely collateral and superficial; and, such as they are, are not likely to be secured by the New Code." [*London Quarterly Review*, 17, no. 34 (January 1862):580]

38. Kay Shuttleworth, "Letter," pp. 418, 419.

39. The Times, 28 September, 1861, p. 12b.

40. "I believe they never could have had children of their own, or, if they had, their sons and daughters could never have performed what they wish these poor children to do. The Minute groups children into four classes; the first class is the infant-school class, ranging from three years old to seven. We will just see what the Committee of Council requires from a child three years of age before he can get a farthing. The child is to read a narrative in monosyllables; is, in writing, to form on a black board or slate, from dictation, letters, capital and small; in arithmetic, to form on a black board or slate from dictation figures up to 20, and to name at sight, add, and subtract figures up to 10. (Laughter) I can only say that my children were never able to reach the black board at the age of three years." [*The Times*, 8 October, 1861, p. 8f]

41. The Times, 11 December, 1861, p. 10d.

42. The Quarterly Review 3, no. 221 (January 1862):113.

43. The Times, 2 November, 1861, p. 10e.

44. Ibid., p. 10f.

45. Ibid., p. 10f.

46. At the time of the Commission there were 675,155 pupils in unassisted schools with 917,255 in assisted. Moreover, in Oxford, for example, out of 339 parishes of less than 600 population only 24 schools were connected with the Privy Council; out of 245 parishes in Devon only two were in connection with it. And there were other areas quite as bad. [Hansard, Third Series 165 cols. 198-199]

47. Ibid., col. 199.

48. Ibid., col. 202.

49. Ibid., col. 203.

50. Ibid., cols. 205, 206.

51. Lowe proposed that: "The managers of schools may claim per scholar 1d. for every attendance after the first 100 at the morning or afternoon meetings, and after the first 12 at the evening meeting of their school. One third part of the sum thus claimable is forfeited if the scholar fails to satisfy the inspector in reading, one third if in writing, one-third if in arithmetic, respectively." [Ibid., col. 217] The attendance requirement was to stop children from being entered just before the examination in order that they might obtain the grant. Lowe did not wish to reward one school for the work of another.

52. Ibid., cols. 217, 219, 222.

53. Ibid., cols. 229-230. On the same day, 13 February 1862, Robert Lowe's superior, Earl Granville, made the same point regarding the cheap/efficiency factor in the House of Lords: "If no improvement takes place in the instruction given, and if the defects pointed out by the Commissioners continue, a great public economy will be effected. On the contrary, if these defects are

removed, I believe that the allowance to the schools will amount, after a very little time, to almost as much as at present. That result, however, will be contemporaneous with enormously increased efficiency in the schools, and with a great increase in the amount of useful instruction received by the children." [Ibid. cols.173-174]

54. Ibid., col. 223. 55. Ibid., cols. 237-239.

56. Mary Sturt, The Education of the People: A History of Primary Education in England and Wales in the Nineteenth Century (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 240.

57. Ibid., col. 238. Lowe's attitude towards the education appropriate to the different classes is very clear in his address "Primary and Classical Education" delivered at Edinburgh in 1867: "The lower classes ought to be educated to discharge the duties cast upon them. They should also be educated that they may appreciate and defer to a higher cultivation when they meet it; and the higher classes ought to be educated in a very different manner, in order that they may exhibit to the lower classes that higher education to which, if it were shown to them, they would bow down and defer." [Robert Lowe, "Primary and Classical Education: An Address Delivered before the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh, on Friday, November 1, 1867" (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1867), p. 32]

58. Hansard, Third Series 165, col. 242. 59. Ibid., col. 249.

60. Asher Tropp, The School Teachers: The Growth of the Teaching Profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day (New York: Macmillan, 1957), p. 84. De Montmorency speaks of "the immense length and the bitterness of the debates" being "evidence of the great hold that the subject had taken upon the country." [J. E. G. De Montmorency, The Progress of Education in England (London: Knight, 1904), p. 121]

61. For an overview of the reactions in educational journals see A. J. Marcham, "The Revised Code of Education, 1862: Reinterpretations and Misinterpretations" History of Education 10, no. 2 (1981), pp. 96-98.

62. Hansard, Third Series 165, col. 997. On March 20 the Bishop of Oxford, returning to the fray, once again condemned the new Code complaining this time of the adverse reflection cast on school managers: "The great evil of the Revised Code was that it was a bill of pains and penalties on the managers of schools, devised as if they were only using their schools as an instrument for extracting public money, and as if they ought to be suspected and watched at every turn, instead of being treated as generous and noble minded men, who gave themselves up disinterestedly to the great cause of education." [Ibid., col. 1860-1861]

63. The Times, 7 March, 1862, p. 9f. On the same day, Earl Granville made the same point in the Lords. He also took pains to disabuse critics of the notion that the Education Department by its introduction of payment by results was intent on discouraging the teaching of subjects other than the three R's. Such subjects were not to be tested for the very practical reason of the great difficulty in doing so: "It would not be very easy, for example, to define the degree of excellence in singing which should entitle a school to pecuniary aid." [Hansard, Third Series 165, col .1150]

64. Ibid., cols. 1012-1013.

65. Matthew Arnold, "The Twice-Revised Code," The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold, ed. R. H. Super, 11 vols. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960-1977), 2:235.

66. Matthew Arnold, "The 'Principle of Examination,'" Ibid., 2:248. 67. Marcham, "Recent Interpretations," pp. 126-127.

68. Hansard, Third Series 166, col. 241. 69. Ibid., art. 51, p. xxiv.

70. "Instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools upon the Administration of the Revised Code," *Report, 1862-63*, art. 8, p. xviii.

71. Report, 1866-67, pp. xcviii-cili.

72. Report, 1871-72, "New Code (1872)," art. 21, p. lxxxdl; also "Fourth Schedule," pp. xcviii-xcix.

73. Report, 1874-75, "New Code (1875)," arts. 19 and 21, pp. cxlvi-cxlviii.

74. Report, 1881-82, "New Code (1882)," art. 109, p. 124.

75. Report, 1890-91, "New Code (1891)," art. 101, pars. a and f, pp. 131-133.

76. Ibid., art. 101, par. b, p. 132.

77. Report, 1894-95, p. xi. See "The Day School Code (1895)," ibid., art. 84, par. b, p. 326.

78. Sylvester, Robert Lowe, p. 82. 79. H.M.I. Bellairs, Report, 1864-65, p. 16.

80. see Synge, Report, 1871-72, p. 179 (hereafter all surnames preceding Report are those of H.M.I.'s).

81. P. David Ellis, "The Effects of the Revised Code of Education in the West Riding of Yorkshire," Journal of Educational Administration and History 19, no. 1 (January 1987), p.9. See also: Synge, Report, 1866-67, p. 315; Allington, Report, 1873-74, p. 43; Hughes, Report, 1873-74, pp. 109-110; Sandford, Report, 1880-81, p. 372.

82. Robinson, Report, 1867-68, p. 213. See Selleck, New Education, p. 32.

83. Robinson, Report, 1867-68, p. 214.

84. G. A. N. Lowndes, The Silent Social Revolution: An Account of Public Education in England and Wales 1895-1965. (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 11.

85. Kennedy, Report, 1867-68, p. 171. See also Binns, Report, 1867-68, p. 79.

86. Campbell, Report, 1867-68, p. 133. 87. Bowstead, Report, 1864-65, p. 182.

88. See Lowndes, Silent Social Revolution, p. 11; Tropp, School Teachers, p. 96; John F. Mann, Education (London: Pitman, 1979), p. 11; E. C. Edmonds, The School Inspector (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Humanities Press, 1962), p. 81.

89. R. J. Montgomery, Examinations: An Account of their Evolution as Administrative Devices in England (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967), p. 40. See also Dunford, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools in England and Wales 1860-1870 (Leeds: Museum of the History of Education, University of Leeds, 1980), p. 40.

90. W. H. G. Armytage, Four Hundred Years of English Education (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 125. See also Ellis, "Effects of Revised Code," p. 4; Jeanette S. Coltham, "Educational Accountability: An English Experiment and its Outcome," School Review 81, no. 1 (Nov. 1972):26.

91. Wardle, English Popular Education, p. 107. See also Curtis, History of Education, p. 287.

92. Blakiston, Report, 1869-70, p. 98. See also Johnstone, Report, 1867-68, p. 158; Parez, Report, 1876-77, p. 535.

93. Binns, Report, 1865-66, p. 63.

94. Waddington, Report, 1872-73, p. 194. See also Watkins, Report, 1872-73, p. 216; Waddington, Report, 1876-77, p. 614; Campbell, Report, 1880-81, p. 227; Pickard, Report, 1882-83, p. 414.

95. See, for example, Warburton, Report, 1865-66, p. 224; Fussell, Report, 1866-67, p. 75.

96. Edmonds, School Inspector, p. 77.

97. Robinson, Report, 1869-70, p. 196.

98. Kennedy, Report, 1867-68, p. 169. See also Stewart, Report, 1864-65, pp. 145-6; Stewart, Report, 1866-67, p. 212; M. Arnold, Report, 1867-68, pp. 292-293; Robinson, Report, 1865-66, p.169. A foreign commentator, Ludwig Wiese, writing in 1879 castigated the teachers for being influenced entirely by the money consideration: "and when it can be publicly said that money has become the sole test of success in elementary school-teaching, then surely something is still rotten in this body and requires a healing hand." [Ludwig Wiese, German Letters on English Education, trans. Leonhard Schmitz (New York: Putnam, 1879), p. 284]

99. Johnstone, Report, 1867-68, p. 158. Asher Tropp argues that salaries decreased only slightly though admittedly at a time of rising prices: "The average salary of a certificated master fell from £95 in 1861 to £87 in 1866 and then rose until in 1869 it stood at £93." [Tropp, School Teachers, p. 96 and note 9]. See also Sharpless, *English Education*, p. 28.

100. Watkins, Report, 1872-73, p. 218.

101. Temple, Report, 1865-66, p. 218.

102. Bowstead, Report, 1866-67, p. 248. See also Gream, Report, 1864-65, p. 84; Thomas, Report, 1866-67, p. 217.

103. See Rice Byrne, Report, 1864-65, p. 34; Fraser, Report, 1865-66, p. 99; Renouf, Report, 1867-68, p. 371; Fussell, Report, 1868-69, p. 104; Du Port, Report, 1872-73, p. 78; Smith, Report, 1872-73, pp. 125-126; Stokes, Report, 1881-82, p. 443; Blandford, Report, 1890-91, p. 359. Nevertheless, class examination, introduced by the 1875 Code for grammar, geography, and history, was welcomed by a number of inspectors. For example, Mr. Sandford declared that "it is easier in an oral examination to test the intelligence of a class than the proficiency of individual children. The latter is apt to become a much more dull and mechanical process than the former." [Sandford, Report, 1876-77, p. 557] Two years later, Inspector Holmes reported that "the re-introduction of class examinations restored that living, personal intercourse between examiner and children, the loss of which, when payment by results came into fashion, was so deeply deplored by many men of experience, teachers as well as inspectors." [Holmes, Report, 1878-79, p. 601]

104. See Howard, Report, 1866-67, p. 116; Fussell, Report, 1866-67, p. 81; E. P. Arnold, Report, 1865-66, p. 25; Meyrick, Report, 1865-66, p. 145; Bonner, Report, 1867-68, p. 124; Robinson, Report, 1867-68, pp. 216-217.

105. Parez, Report, 1866-67, p. 148.

106. Auberon Herbert, The Sacrifice of Education to Examination (London and Edinburgh: Williams and Northgate, 1880), p. 105. Inspector Swettenham in 1877 also criticized the neglect of the cleverer pupils: "It does not pay the master of a large school to devote himself to the advancement of his best boys; if he has an eye to the grant only he knows his time will be more profitably employed in securing the universal acquirement of the amount of knowledge necessary to obtain a pass. Thus the elementary schoolmaster is deprived of what would be to many the most interesting part of their work, and the upper boys fail to obtain that extra care and attention which in a higher grade school is almost universally bestowed on their superior abilities." [Swettenham, Report, 1877-78, p. 558]

107. Alderson, Report, 1865-66, p. 248. See also M. Arnold, *Report, 1876-77*, p. 403.

108. Gillian Sutherland, Elementary Education in the Nineteenth Century (London: The Historical Association, 1971), p. 41.

109. Oakeley, Report, 1873-74, p. 139; see also Tinling, Report, 1864-65, p. 154.

110. See Waddington, Report, 1876-77, p. 521; Nutt, Report, 1866-67, p. 141; Binns, Report, 1865-66, p. 61; Binns, Report, 1873-74, pp. 70-71.

111. However, see Wilde, Report, 1870-71, p. 242.

112. Tregarthen, Report, 1868-69, pp. 258-259.

113. Mary Sturt, Education of the People, p. 266.

114. Binns, Report, 1865-66, p. 61.

115. Stokes, Report, 1866-67, p. 382. See also: Warburton, Report, 1865-66, p. 225; Koe, Report, 1864-65, p. 107; Waddington, Report, 1864-65, p. 201; Sandford, Report, 1865-66, pp. 76-77; Moncrieff, Report, 1865-66, p. 154; Howard, Report, 1866-67, p. 117; Tregarthen, Report, 1866-67, p. 226; Bowstead, Report, 1866-67, p. 245; Wilde, Report, 1870-71, p. 242.

116. Sloss, Report, 1867-68, p. 70.

117. See Wilde, Report, 1870-71, p. 244; Sloss, Report, 1865-66, p. 59.

118. Kennedy, Report, 1877-78, p. 463.

119. Alderson, Report, 1867-68, p. 208. See also Mitchell, Report, 1868-69, p. 131; Pennethorne, Report, 1875-76, p. 385; Johnstone, Report, 1880-81, p. 352.

120. Smith, Report, 1870-71, p. 186.

121. See Fussell, Report, 1876-77, p. 481.

122. Stokes, Report, 1873-74, p. 208.

123. Kennedy, Report, 1877-78, p. 463.

124. See Barry, Report, 1873-74, p. 83.

125. Mitchell, Report, 1865-66, p. 125. See also Mitchell, Report, 1864-65, p. 114; Mitchell, Report, 1868-69, p. 131; Sandford, Report, 1866-67, p. 202; Tregarthen, Report, 1866-67, p. 226.

126. Blakiston, Report, 1867-68, p. 100. See Capel, Report, 1868-69, pp. 58-59; Gream, Report, 1874-75, p. 92; Claughton, Report, 1878-79, p. 526.

127. See Scoltock, Report, 1865-66, p. 280; Bowstead, Report, 1864-65, p. 164; Barry, Report, 1865-66, p. 48; Capel, Report, 1870-71, p. 44.

128. Kennedy, Report, 1867-68, p. 173.

129. Charles Birchenough, History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day (London: University Tutorial Press, 1930), p. 347.

130. F. Storr (ed.), Life and Remains of the Rev. R. H. Quick (London and New York: Macmillan, 1900), pp. 146-147. As one who was at school during the time of payment by results put it: "Little or no notice was taken of a child's health, comfort or well-being; that was someone else's business, certainly not the schoolmaster's." [John Burnett (ed.), Destiny Obscure: Autobiographies of Childhood, Education and Family from the 1820s to the 1920s (London: Penguin, 1982), p. 196]

131. Richard Bourne and Brian MacArthur, The Struggle for Education 1870-1970: A Pictorial History of Popular Education and the National Union of Teachers (London: Schoolmaster Publishing Co., c1970), p. 21.

132. A. J. Swinburne, Memories of a School Inspector: Thirty-Five Years in Lancashire and Suffolk (Published by the author, 1912), pp. 77-78. See also Storr, Life and Remains, p. 146; Lowndes, Silent Social Revolution, p. 13.

133. Burnett, Destiny Obscure, p. 194.

134. See Johnstone, Report, 1876-77, p. 505.

135. Perez, Report, 1876-77, p. 529.

136. Alderson, Report, 1865-66, p. 246.

137. Bellairs, Report, 1871-72, p. 32; see also Balmer, Report, 1876-77, p. 423; Stewart, Report, 1877-78, p. 542; Stewart, Report, 1878-80, pp. 393-396.

138. Quoted in John Lawson and Harold Silver, A Social History of Education in England (London: Methuen, 1973), pp. 290-291.

139. Nutt, Report, 1864-65, p. 119.

140. Morell, Report, 1864-65, p. 185; see also Hernaman, Report, 1869-70, pp. 137-138.

141. Kennedy, Report, 1869-70, p. 153.

142. See, for example, Birley, Report, 1864-65, p. 30; Nutt, Report, 1864-65, p. 120; Fitch, Report, 1867-68, p. 341; Sandford, Report, 1880-81, p. 375.

143. Tregarthen, Report, 1870-71, p. 221.

144. Campbell, Report, 1867-68, p. 134. See also: Waddington, Report, 1879-80, p. 433; Warburton, Report, 1867-68, pp. 266-267; Howard, Report, 1866-67, p. 112; Watkins, Report, 1867-68, pp. 274-275; Alderson, Report, 1867-68, pp. 286-287; Allington, Report, 1869-70, p. 28; Ronouf, Report, 1869-70, p. 363; Watkins, Report, 1872-73, p. 217; Alderson, Report, 1873-74, p. 30; Boyle, Report, 1876-77, pp. 438-439; Johnstone, Report, 1876-77, p. 504; Rice-Wiggins, Report, 1876-77, p. 547; Stewart, Report, 1877-78, p. 543; Coward, Report, 1891-92, p. 355.

145. See, for example, Sharpe, Report, 1865-66, p. 209; Robinson, Report, 1867-68, p. 217; Sharpe, Report, 1869-70, p. 223; Pryce, Report, 1870-71, p. 153; Barry, Report, 1891-92, p. 330.

146. Blakiston, Report, 1864-65, p. 270. See also E. M. Sneyd-Kynnersley, H.M.I.: Some Passages in the Life of One of H.M. Inspectors of Schools (London: Macmillan, 1908), p. 64.

147. Temple, Report, 1869-70, p. 239.

148. See Fussell, Report, 1866-67, p. 76; Christopher Martin, A Short History of English Schools 1750-1965 (U.K.: Wayland, 1979), p. 50.

149. Wilkinson, Report, 1879-80, p. 451.

150. See for example Campbell, Report, 1867-68, p. 134; Morell, Report, 1868-69, p. 290; Sharpe, Report, 1873-74, p. 193; Pennethorne, Report, 1875-76, p. 80.

151. Robinson, Report, 1867-68, p. 218; also Alderson, Report, 1867-68, pp. 285-286.

152. Routledge, Report, 1868-69, p. 185. See also Nutt, Report, 1866-67, p. 141.

153. Brodie, Report, 1869-70, p. 307.

154. See for example: Morell, Report, 1864-65, p. 185; Waddington, Report, 1864-65, p. 196; Barry, Report, 1865-66, p. 49; King, Report, 1865-66, p. 137; Meyrick, Report, 1865-66, p. 145; Byrne, Report, 1866-67, p. 32; Howard, Report, 1866-67, p. 114; Mitchell, Report, 1866-67, p. 126; Kennedy, Report, 1867-68, p. 170; Barry, Report, 1869-70, p. 89.

155. Gordon and Lawton, Curriculum Change, p. 184.

156. See Nutt, Report, 1866-67, p. 140.

157. Bowstead, Report, 1866-67, p. 247.

158. See Morell, Report, 1864-65, p. 184; Horace, Report, 1864-65, p. 198; Waddington, Report, 1866-67, p. 278.

159. D. R. Fearon, School Inspection (London: Macmillan, 1876), p. 44. See also Routledge, Report, 1868-69, p. 187; Sandford, Report, 1876-77, p. 556.

160. Capel, Report, 1868-69, p. 82.

161. Alderson, Report, 1867-68. See also Morrell, Report, 1868-69, p. 291.

182. Fitch, Report, 1878-79, p. 553. It should be pointed out that nine years earlier in 1869 Fitch had stressed that the "mechanical" character of the instruction was more the fault of the teachers than of the Revised Code itself. [Fitch, Report, 1868-70, pp. 328-327]

183. Bellairs, Report, 1868-69, p. 22. See also E. P. Arnold, Report, 1865-66, pp. 23-24; Johnstone, Report, 1867-68, p. 157.

184. Blandford, Report, 1867-68, p. 116.

185. M. Arnold, Report, 1867-68, p. 297. See also M. Arnold, Report, 1871-72, p. 29; Bowstead, Report, 1872-73, p. 47; Bellairs, Report, 1871-72, p. 32; Campbell, Report, 1872-73, p. 60; Fussell, Report, 1872-73, p. 86.

186. Byrne, Report, 1868-69, p. 43; Allington, Report, 1869-70, p. 29; Robinson, Report, 1869-70, p. 196; Brodie, Report, 1872-73, p. 51; Moncreiff, Report, 1875-76, p. 360. See, however, Johnstone, Report, 1880-81, p. 350.

187. Quoted in Norman Morris, "An Historian's View of Examinations," in Examinations and English Education, ed. Stephen Wiseman (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1961), pp. 8-9.

188. H. Holman, English National Education: A Sketch of the Rise of Public Elementary Schools in England (London: Blackie, 1898), p. 171.

189. See Balmer, Report, 1880-81, p. 244.

170. Stewart, Report, 1864-65, p. 150.

171. Campbell, Report, 1880-81, p. 276.

172. Harrison, Report, 1881-82, p. 317.

173. Parez, Report, 1866-67, p. 158.

174. Bowstead, Report, 1864-65, p. 161.

175. Barry, Report, 1865-66, p. 47.

176. E. P. Arnold, Report, 1865-66, p. 22; Bowstead, Report, 1872-73, pp. 48-49; Blakiston, Report, 1878-79, p. 478.

177. Bellairs, Report, 1871-72, p. 34.

178. Stuart Maclure, One Hundred Years of London Education, 1870-1970 (London: Penguin, 1970), p. 63.

179. Michael Hyndman, Schools and Schooling, p. 33.

180. Pennethorne, Report, 1875-76, pp. 378-79.

181. Quoted in Marjorie Cruickshank, Church and State in English Education: 1870 to the Present Day (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963), p. 57.

182. Spencer, Inspector's Testament, p. 92. See also Swinburne, Memories, p. 77; Dunford, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, p. 30.

183. Steele, Report, 1876-77, pp. 586-87.

184. Temple, Report, 1869-70, p. 238.

185. Watts, Report, 1868-69, pp. 263-264.

186. Byrne, Report, 1866-67, p. 42.

187. Holman, English National Education, pp. 170-171.

188. Sylvester, Robert Lowe, Ch. 5 passim.

189. John Hurt, Education in Evolution: Church, State, Society and Popular Education 1800-1870 (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1971), p. 222.

190. Edmonds, School Inspector, p. 79.

191. Quoted in Simon, Education and the Labour Movement, p. 119.

192. Selleck, New Education, p. 39.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991